

Manuscript No.: NO. 59405

Title: Healthy individuals vs. patients with bipolar or unipolar depression in gray matter volume

Journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Response to Reviewer's Comments

Dear Editor-in-Chief,

We thank the Editor-in-Chief for the response about our manuscript entitled "Healthy individuals vs. patients with bipolar or unipolar depression in gray matter volume", submitted for consideration for publication in the World Journal of Clinical Cases.

We are grateful to the Editor-in-Chief and Reviewers for the sound and constructive comments. By addressing these remarks, questions, and suggestions (see the point-by-point response below), we think we have substantially improved our manuscript.

We hope the current version would fulfill your editorial requirements. Please contact me if you have further questions.

Best wishes,

Dr Wu

POINT-BY-POINT RESPONSES TO THE COMMENTS OF REVIEWER #1

Comment 1: Please provide the ethics committee number.

Response: We thank the Reviewer. The approval number was added to the manuscript in the “Study design and subjects” section of Methods ([2017]0301).

Comment 2: Several typos should be corrected thorough the text.

Response: We thank the Reviewer as the manuscript was proofread.

Comment 3: Conclusion Section is missing. Is necessary to add it (moving from discussion section), including some "take-home message".

Response: We thank the Reviewer for this sound advice. The conclusion is now separated and includes a take-home message as followed:

“In conclusion, UD patients showed smaller GMVs than the controls in the right fusiform gyrus, left inferior occipital gyrus, left paracentral lobule, right superior and inferior temporal gyri, and right posterior lobe of the cerebellum, and larger GMVs than the controls in the left posterior central gyrus and left middle frontal gyrus. There were no differences in GMV between patients with BD and those with UD. Although different patterns of change were observed, the present study does not suggest VBM as a supplementary technique for the differential diagnosis of UD and BD, and additional studies with a larger sample size will be necessary. Classification techniques based on machine learning could be explored^[26].”

POINT-BY-POINT RESPONSES TO THE COMMENTS OF EDITOR'S OFFICE

Comment 1: I found no "Author contribution" section. Please provide the author contributions

Response: We thank the Editor. We added the statement at the end of the manuscript as followed:

HL designed the study. YZ diagnosed and treated the patients and participated in data collection. CX and ZS performed imaging examination and analysis. YH followed the patients to assess their outcomes. YZ and RW conducted data analysis and prepared the manuscript. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

Comment 2: I found the authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s).

Response: We are sorry for this. We uploaded the form along with this revision.

Comment 3: I found the authors did not provide the original figures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.

Response: We are sorry for this. We uploaded the figures in .ppt format along with this revision.

Comment 3: I found the authors did not write the "article highlight" section. Please write the "article highlights" section at the end of the main text.

Response: We thank the Reviewer as the Highlights section was provided in the revised manuscript.

Comment 4: the author should number the references in Arabic numerals according to the citation order in the text. The reference numbers will be superscripted in square brackets at the end of the sentence with the citation content or after the cited author's name, with no spaces.

Response: The references were revised accordingly.