Reviewer#1

Specific comments to authors

The purpose of this study is to examine the evolution and growth of publications related to dialysis and depression. The objectives are to determine the quantity of publications, the most active countries, funding and sponsoring institutions, and journals, as well as to conduct citation and research topic analysis. Overall, I believe this paper holds significant value.

Response: I would like to thank you for the thorough reading of the manuscript and the professional comments and constructive recommendations, which help improve this manuscript's quality. After revising our manuscript to address the reviewers' Comment, we have had it rechecked by a native speaker of English. As a consequence, many minor grammatical and stylistic edits have been made throughout the text. We hope that this revised manuscript meets your expectations.

However, considering the inherent limitations of bibliometric studies, I suggest that the authors make the following modifications:

1. The authors should pay more attention to the analysis and clustering of different keywords. It is important to explore the associations between each keyword and other related keywords, which requires further analysis.

   Response: Thank you for this suggestion. I added more information to be clear (page 8)

2. From the perspective of bibliometrics, the paper should provide a more in-depth analysis on how to reflect the future research directions. These revisions will enhance the quality and impact of the paper.

   Response: Thank you for this suggestion. I added more information to discussion

Reviewer#2

Specific comments to authors

While the article provides a comprehensive overview of the current state of research on dialysis and depression, there are several areas where it could be improved.

Response: I would like to thank you for the thorough reading of the manuscript and the professional comments and constructive recommendations, which help improve this manuscript's quality. After revising our manuscript to address the reviewers' Comment, we have had it rechecked by a native speaker of English. As a consequence, many minor grammatical and stylistic edits have been made throughout the text. We hope that this revised manuscript meets your expectations.

Firstly, the article could benefit from a more detailed explanation of the methodology used to conduct the study. While the authors briefly mention that they used Scopus as the target database and VOSviewer software to create network maps, they do not provide a detailed explanation of how they selected the publications to include in the study or how they analyzed the data.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. I added more information to be clear (see methods, pages 6 and 7)

Secondly, the article could benefit from a more critical evaluation of the limitations of bibliometric and visualization mapping. While these methods can be useful for identifying research trends and knowledge gaps, they are not without limitations, such as the potential for bias in the selection of publications and the inability to capture the full complexity of research topics.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. I added more information to limitations (page 14)

Finally, the article could benefit from a more detailed discussion of the implications of the study's findings for future research on dialysis and depression

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. I added more information to discussion (pages 13 and 14)

Revision reviewer

Specific comments to authors

The authors have made revisions based on the reviewers' comments and I have no further comments.

Thanks for your comments.

Dear editor

Editor-in-Chief

 Hope this finds you well

Re: Revised Manuscript Submission (Manuscript No: 85219)

We would like to express our sincere gratitude for taking the time to review our manuscript and for providing us with such insightful and constructive feedback. Your and reviewers' comments and recommendations have been extremely valuable to us, and we truly appreciate the effort and dedication you have put into reviewing our work.

Your thorough reading of the manuscript and your professional comments have greatly helped us to improve the quality of our work. We were impressed by the depth of your analysis and the attention you paid to even the smallest details. Your suggestions have guided us in refining our arguments, clarifying our explanations, and presenting our ideas more effectively.

We cannot thank you enough for your contribution to our manuscript. Your support has been instrumental in helping us to achieve our goals, and we are grateful for your willingness to share your expertise and knowledge with us. We hope that we can continue to collaborate in the future and that your feedback will help us to create even better work.

Our responses to the comments are highlighted in yellow in the revised manuscript. We carefully addressed all comments of the reviewers. A point-by-point reply to the comments is given below. We hope that we appropriately address all comments. **We look forward to you and reviewers' comments on the manuscript and hope that the manuscript is given favorable consideration for publication in** *World Journal of Psychiatry.*

Yours sincerely

- I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Psychiatry, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted.

Response: thank you for this decision

- I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Response: Dear editor, thank you very much for the comments and suggestions. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to improve and resubmit our manuscript. The comments and suggestions are valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our manuscript. According to the referees' comments and suggestions, we have made revisions, as described in the authors' response.

- Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.

Response: we added all the figures to PPT

- In order to respect and protect the author's intellectual property rights and prevent others from misappropriating figures without the author's authorization or abusing figures without indicating the source, we will indicate the author's copyright for figures originally generated by the author, and if the author has used a figure published elsewhere or that is copyrighted, the author needs to be authorized by the previous publisher or the copyright holder and/or indicate the reference source and copyrights. Please check and confirm whether the figures are

original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2023.

Response: All our figures were original. We followed your suggestions.

- Authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content.

Response: we adjusted the tables as you recommended

- Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the RCA. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/.

Response: very thanks for this suggestion. We used it (see methods Page 6, and Table 5).