

Dear Editor,

We thank you for considering our manuscript n°80200 intituled “**Depression among medical students in Tunisia: Prevalence and associated factors**” for peer review and potential publication in *World Journal of Psychiatry* and thank you to allow us to respond to the reviewers’ comments.

We also thank the reviewers for their valuable comments, which have further improved the manuscript. The author team has reviewed the manuscript based on the comments. A detailed response to each comment is below.

Please find a modified manuscript in a separate file. All changes made in the manuscript are highlighted in yellow. If you have any other comments for the manuscript, we are happy to work on it further.

Sincerely,

Response to Reviewer’s code: 06195078
--

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.

- Reply: Thank you for your comment. We have re-edited the updated submission for proper English language, grammar, punctuation, spelling, and overall style.

The discussion part is too complicated and needs to be simplified, and some content should be included in the results

- Reply: Thank you for your comment. We have re-edited the discussion and the result parts and simplified it.

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

- Reply: Thank you for your comment. We have reduced and verified the references.

Response to Reviewer’s code: 06208740
--

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.

- Reply: Thank you for your comment. We have re-edited the introduction section according to the reviewer's advice.

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.

- Reply: Thank you for your comment. We have mentioned that "The self-report questionnaire employed took approximately 15 minutes to answer" in the method section, also we specified further the method section according to the reviewer's advice.

- 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 participate? 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?

- Reply: Thank you for your comment. We have specified further the methodology according to the reviewer's advice.

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.

- Reply: Thank you for your comment. We have re-edited the discussion.

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.

- Reply: Thank you for your comment. We have re-edited the updated submission for proper English language, grammar, punctuation, spelling, and overall style.

Response to Reviewer's code: 06208740
--

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?

- Reply: Thank you for your comment. As the sample is 70% of female gender we do think that the gender distribution may affect the physical activities, we mentioned that in the text

"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?

- Reply: Thank you for your comment, we agree that despite that statistically $p < 0.05$ is significant, the age difference is not meaningful, we mentioned that in the text

The figure "The study's flowchart" needs to be labeled as Figure 1 xxxx.

- Reply: Thank you for your comment. We have labeled the figure.