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Dear Matthew Hickey and/or Sir(s):

Attached please find a copy of my manuscript entitled, “A Research Study Review of Effectiveness of Treatments for Psychiatric Conditions Common to End-stage Cancer Patients: Needs Assessment for Future Research and an Impassioned Plea” for inclusion in your journal.

Thank you for the re-review and the vote of confidence in terms of a tentative acceptance for publication in BMC Psychiatry. Let me assure you I have attempted to carry out the essential
revisions you have requested with all due speed. I also appreciate Reviewer #2’s further interest and request for some very minor cosmetic and copy-edit revisions, and I scrubbed the entire document to ensure her request was honored. If there has been any apparent delay in my doing so, I regret it.

This response letter will first address those items on which you requested and then treat the matters that Reviewer #2 raised separately.

(1) I moved the Declarations section so that it appears after the Conclusions section. Additionally, I used full sentences for this section. And when a Declaration was not relevant to the manuscript, I stated “not applicable.”

(2) I have attempted to follow your instructions to the letter and conform in accordance with BMC Psychiatry submission guidelines per the web link you provided.

(3) I have described 2x in the paper where and how the “raw” data generated/analysed during my study can be obtained. I have included the statement “The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.”

(4) I have stated "Not applicable" (in a full sentence) in the Consent for Publication as no personal information is provided in my manuscript.

(5) The Acknowledgments section has been used to acknowledge anyone who contributed towards the article but did not meet the criteria for authorship including anyone who provided professional writing services or materials.

(6) I have amended my Funding statement so that it includes the full, unabbreviated names of any and all funding bodies that contributed directly (none) and indirectly (in-kind) to the research presented in this manuscript and the extent of involvement in terms of design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data, in writing the manuscript, the direct funding of aspects of the research, or presentation of the manuscript (none).
(7) Per your instruction, in the Authors’ contributions section, I named myself, as represented by my initials.

(8) I removed any figure titles and captions from the figure files so they contain the image graphics only. Upon doing this, I placed the titles/captions at the end of the main manuscript after the References section under a newly created “Figure Legend” heading.

(9) I removed the response to reviewers from the file inventory, as it is no longer needed at this stage of the editorial process. Nevertheless, your correspondence requires that a new letter be drafted that inventories point-by-point all requests for revision and clarification and their redress. I have not included this a part of the manuscript.

(10) When I submitted my manuscript I submitted a single clean copy without any tracked changes, colored or highlighted text.

Reviewer #2

I really admire Reviewer #2’s continued involvement and passion regarding this manuscript and I am eternally grateful for her circumspect eyes. I really appreciate Reviewer #2’s vote of confidence that I have addressed all her suggested revisions and that the manuscript is well-written, informative, and interesting.

Reviewer #2 had 2 minor suggested revisions that I could make at my discretion.

(1) Change Electro Convulsive Shock Treatment (read Therapy) to Electro Convulsive Treatment: Done.

(2) Error spelling Risperidone: Done. Just to err on the side of caution, entire manuscript scrubbed for misspelling Risperidone. Issue: There are several common variations of the
spelling due to generics vs. product brands. Reviewer #2’s variant was used as it is generic, common across the Internet, and it’s the one physicians have arrived on.

I cannot thank Reviewer #2 enough for her continued interest and intense involvement in the subject matter, constructive suggestions, and commitment to honing the end-product manuscript to perfection.

There are no changes to authorship or order of authorships, of course, as I am the sole author. By re-submitting my manuscript, I confirm that all the author details on the revised version are true and correct, I agree for authorship of this manuscript, and I have appropriate permissions and rights to reported data.

Understand, I am very committed to this project and I am underwriting research and production costs myself, which in this era of austerity are considerable.

Therefore, I look forward to an acceptance and publication soon.

If you have any questions etc…., do not hesitate to contact me (rijjohnson@mdanderson.org; jay.johnson@us.army.mil; 832-372-3511), and I will be delighted to respond

Thank you in advance for your consideration and commitment and I look forward to seeing the manuscript in print in BMJ.

Very Respectfully Yours,

Jay Johnson, Ph.D., PA-C, MAT, MHAS

Houston, Texas