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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for giving us the chance to revise our manuscript “The mental health of neurological doctors and nurses in Hunan Province, China during the initial stages of the COVID-19 outbreak” (BPSY-D-20-00243R2). We are truly grateful to the reviewers’ thoughtful suggestions. Our paper was edited for proper English language, grammar, punctuation, spelling, and overall style by one or more of the highly qualified native English-speaking editors at AJE. Below you can find our point-by-point responses to the reviewers’ comments. Attached please find the revised manuscript and Editing Certificate.

We would like to express our great appreciation to you for comments on our paper. Looking forward to hearing from you.

Thank you and best regards.

Yours sincerely,

Changqing Chen

Reviewer 1:
Thank you for revision. I agree for publication.
Response: Thank you for your agreement for publication.

Reviewer 2:
Thank you for your thorough revision of this manuscript. I feel that all comments have been addressed sufficiently. I have just a couple of remaining comments that should be addressed prior to publication:

1. Thank you for providing additional information about the sampling methodology. Although, I do recognize the difficulty in obtaining a population-based sample at this time, this study used a convenience sample, which is not ideal for estimating prevalence due to selection bias. This should be noted in the limitations. Is there any reason to believe that the sample is different in key ways from the target population (i.e., all neurological clinicians in the region)? If so, it should be noted, and the potential impact on study results described. Also, was the sampling truly snowball sampling (individuals who participated then helped recruit additional participants), or was it simply a convenience sample?
Response:
Thank you for the very useful comments. We agree with these suggestions and have revised the manuscript accordingly.

1) Given the fact that the investigation was performed during the COVID-19 epidemics, the quarantine measures demanded less face-to-face communication and contact. Therefore, an anonymous questionnaire was conducted on a non-commercial mobile app using snowball sampling measures, which is a non-probability sampling technique. The limitation of snowball sampling due to selection bias was noted in the limitations part.

2) The electronic questionnaire was taken and well-accepted mainly by young people. Most healthcare workers in our study were young, which may be different from our target population (all neurological clinicians in the region) and it might cause sampling bias and the results may be biased to some extent.

3) We distributed those questionnaires to neurological healthcare workers in Hunan Province via WeChat. And then we asked these participants to send the survey link to their colleagues whom they considered suitable for this online survey, and their colleagues were also encouraged to further send the link to their own WeChat contact networks.

2. There are some areas that could use proofreading for grammar. For example, the first sentence of the abstract is not a complete sentence. The first sentence in the Results section about prevalence should also be in past tense. An additional, thorough proofread would be helpful.
Response: Our paper was edited one or more of the highly qualified native English-speaking editors at AJE. Please see the attached Editing Certificate.