PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 80200

Title: Depression among medical students in Tunisia: Prevalence and associated factors

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06195078

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Tunisia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-05

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-06 01:38

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-06 12:40

Review time: 11 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a good article. The author has done a lot of statistical analysis. Language and spelling need further improvement Percentage needs to be further checked The discussion part is too complicated and needs to be simplified, and some content should be included in the results The author cited too many references, so it is unnecessary to compare the research data with the study in each country, because this is not a review article

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 80200

Title: Depression among medical students in Tunisia: Prevalence and associated factors

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06208740

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Full Professor, Nurse

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Portugal

Author's Country/Territory: Tunisia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-05

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-20 21:33

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-02 23:16

Review time: 13 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

| statements | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I appreciate the opportunity to review this manuscript and hope my comments assist in the revision process. The material is interesting and the topic is timely and relevant. The method seems to have been followed faithfully and the authors were well-positioned to conduct the analysis. Despite these positives, in my view, the paper needs more work before it could be published and I have made some specific suggestions below. Introduction - The literature addressed is not described accurately so far as I can see. Relevant literature should be presented more deeply in order to support the research problem.   - Further, there is no clear distinction between manuscript sections in terms of the content they report. First, I suggest dividing the section "INTRODUCTION" into three components, respectively introduction (explain the general argument of the paper, without going into specific details) background (situate the study concepts within the context of extant knowledge, discuss the international relevance of the concepts) and purpose, creating greater clarity in the analysis of the reader. What is the study's biggest contribution? The contribution should be clearly stated in the introduction. - This investigation needs an additional subheading about the theoretical framework used. Method - In your methods section, say that you used the STROBE cross-sectional reporting guidelines. - Survey distribution methods [website - link, email invite,...]? The time needed to complete the questionnaire is not mentioned, this information is relevant. - Sample selection (criteria should be detailed - internet access, reading and writing in the language under study)? What were the expected effect sizes? There is no clear mention of the sample size that was targeted and obtained to meet the sample size requirements for data analysis. Some subjects refused to participated? Response rate? - The process of analysis should be made as transparent as possible. What strategies were

used to avoid duplications or fraud in the online survey? Did you analyze any potential non-response bias? And early vs late bias? Did you check if data can suffer from common method bias? - Please, provide the ethics approval number. - If the questionnaire was distributed online, how did the authors respect all ethical aspects? Was there compensation for participating in the survey? Discussion - No results should be reported in this section. - Some of the contributions that are highlighted here could be flagged in the introduction for a more consistent narrative throughout the paper. I believe there should be better integration of the results with the existing literature. - Theoretical and methodological limitations should be emphasized more deeply. CHECKLIST FOR STYLE The manuscript will serve a broad audience of students, researchers, and practitioners, however, the manuscript needs to be carefully and attentively proofread, because some sentences are awkwardly constructed, punctuation is deficient, and therefore reading is occasionally difficult to follow.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 80200

Title: Depression among medical students in Tunisia: Prevalence and associated factors

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06082164

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Research Associate

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Tunisia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-05

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-25 02:33

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-03 09:26

Review time: 9 Days and 6 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study aimed to assess the prevalence of depressive symptoms among Tunisian medical students and evaluate its associated factors. Data were collected from 4 faculties of medicine using a socio-demographic questionnaire and the Beck Depression Inventory II (BDI-II) with 1138 medical students.   In 2.2.1. Physical activities, "Almost seventy percent of the sample don't practice any physical activity. Among them, 551 (67.5%) met the BDI-II criteria of depression." Considering the gender differences in the sample, whether the physical activities are related to the gender distribution differences in the sample? "Depressive symptoms were associated with age (p= 0.048)", In Table 3,"Age 21.82 (2.059) 22.10 (2.492)", Is this age difference meaningful? The figure "The study's flowchart" needs to be labeled as Figure 1 xxxx.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 80200

Title: Depression among medical students in Tunisia: Prevalence and associated factors

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06082164

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Research Associate

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Tunisia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-05

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-23 17:58

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-23 18:27

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author has adequately responded to the points and I have no further comments.