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Dear reviewer,

We appreciate that you have offered your time to read and review our paper. Your opinion has been important for us for further work with the manuscript. A good quality of the paper is necessary since it will be a part of academic disputation of one of the authors.

Our comments and answers to the individual points of your review:

1. *Commendable job conducting this treatment study but...* Thanks for your positive view to the project and study. As you see, the results e.g. those concerning deep sleep are really unexpected. We believe that the findings can be of practical importance and, therefore, the publication is desirable.

2. *The introduction is extremely brief.* We agree and, as you will see in the revised version, it has been completely rewritten.

3. *The method section should be extended e.g. how the hypnotics were discontinued.* We agree and have extended the text in the new version.

4. *Unexpected results.* Some of the findings were quite surprising for us, too. We reviewed the structure of the groups, explored the reliability of the data – but did not find any weakness except a limited size of the material. We mention it in Discussion now.

5. *Unsound, limited interest.* Not easy to oppose but, we think, is does not agree with the positive opinion in the previous parts of the Report. We also refer to the Report of the second reviewer stating that „...the study is sound and the data valuable“. In any case, the manuscript has been substantially changed now and we hope that your opinion will be different.

Please find the new version of the paper, rewritten according to most of your and the second reviewer’s comments. We hope that you will find that the manuscript has been substantially improved and that it can be published in its revised version.

We thank you for your comments which were helpful to make all the improvements in the new version.

With best regards, yours

Lucie Zavesicka, M.D.
Sleep Unit,
Prague Psychiatric Center
Authors’ Comments to the Reviewer’s 2 Report (MP)

Dear reviewer,

We appreciate your comments to our paper. Your opinion has been important for us for further work with the manuscript. A good quality of the paper is necessary since it will be a part of academic disputation of one of the authors. (Please notify some confusion between the title in the review and that in the manuscript).

Our answers to the individual points in your review:

1. *The study is sound and the data are valuable.* Thanks! We have really been encouraged to undertake the necessary revisions.

2. *The question posed are not well defined.* Your suggestions have been valuable to complete the manuscript with clearly stated questions in the Introduction.

3. *The Introduction is not well crafted and does not take into account the literature.* We have completely rewritten the Introduction and included some of the references suggested, too.

4. *The study design and components of CBTi not adequately described.* We have broadened this part of the text. Moreover, we realise that an labelling of the subgroups in the previous text/table was unclear. We use the term "dependent/non-dependent" now although we are uncertain whether or not the patients’ condition can be defined as true dependence.

5. *Stimulus Control Instructions not used.* Yes, they have been used and we state it clearly in the text now.

6. *Data acquisition not described in details.* A problem: we employed a conventional method of scoring, conventional definitions... We are convinced that a typical reader is well familiar with these methods and more details would be superfluous. However, we completed the text with details on the EEG montages.

7. *Attention should be paid to separate between the Methods and Results.* We reviewed the text and made some changes accordingly.

8. *The results not well explicated.* We added a new part, separately describing the findings in both subgroups. We reviewed the other part, too, and made some changes accordingly.

9. *The Discussion is not adequate.* We have re-written the Discussion completely. The goals, findings and limitations are more clearly described now. We agree that the statement about zopidem’s effect on depression is a pure speculation and, therefore, we omitted it.

10. *The title needs to be redone.* See above, there has been some confusion about the titles, caused by a simultaneous submission of two papers.

11. *English should be reviewed.* The new version of the manuscript has been supervised by a professional translator now.
Once more, we appreciate you comments which have been valuable to reconsider many parts of the manuscript. As you will see, the paper has been completely rewritten in accordance with your and the second reviewer’s comments. We hope that you will find it to be improved and suitable for publication now.

With best regards yours

Lucie Zavesicka,
Sleep Unit, Prague Psychiatric Center