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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Dr. K. Luan Phan,
Dear Mr. Carlo Rye Chuan,

Thank you for your e-mail dated 22.05.2014. We revised our manuscript according to the reviewer’s comments. We are grateful for this opportunity and have included a point-by-point reply as well as the revised version of the manuscript, with all modified passages highlighted.

Reviewer 1:
1. Overlapping territories (NAc, ALIC, and VC/VS) has not been mentioned until discussion
   We thank the reviewer for this comment and agree that it should be mentioned before. Therefore we included information about the location of these structures in the results section (p 6, line 19).

2. Pooled analysis
   We totally agree that calculating the mean Y-BOCS improvement for each target improves the quality of this review therefore we included the means at the end of each table. For NAc, ALIC and VC/VS we mention the pooled mean in the discussion part (page 14, line 21). Unfortunately, not all publications include the information necessary for such an analysis. Those publications have been marked with an asterisk.

Reviewer 2:
1. Figure with anatomical locations of target structures
   We agree that a figure would greatly add to the understanding of the location, we therefore included a figure by J. Luigjes and colleagues with their permission.

2. Explaining the usual contacts chosen in each (most dorsal vs most ventral), will help in picturing the very important discussion point the authors raise about this "superordinate brain region"
   We understand that this would be of high interest. But due to capacity on the one side and because of lacking information in the original reports on the other side, we cannot include this aspect in the current review.

3. Impact of the stimulation in the network (Cameron McIntyre)
   We are grateful for this important comment. We included the aspect of network effects in the discussion (page 15, line 17).

4. Punctuation (page 4, line 17)
   We corrected the mistake in punctuation.
5. “Ethics” committee vs. “ethical” committee
We are thankful for careful reading and of course made the correction (page 4, line 31).

We want to thank the reviewers for their effort.

All co-authors have seen and agree with the contents of the manuscript.
With best regards,

Sina Kohl and Jens Kuhn