Reviewer #1:
Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)
Novelty of This Manuscript: Grade B (Good)
Creativity or Innovation of This Manuscript: Grade B (Good)
Scientific Significance of the Conclusion in This Manuscript: Grade B (Good)
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments To Authors: I read with great interest the Manuscript titled "Analysis of risk factors leading to anxiety and depression in patients with prostate cancer after castration and the construction of a risk prediction mode". This study investigated the factors that influence postoperative anxiety and depression in PC patients. Authors adequately described the background, presented status and significance of the study. According to the result of this study, healthcare professionals can develop effective intervention and support strategies to meet the mental health needs of these patients. I have only a minor point to discuss. In the Validation of the risk prediction model, it is suggested to add information about SDS/SAS scores of the validation group and population classification. It is recommended to indicate and propose the next research direction in the article. I recommend accepting this manuscript for publication after a minor editing.

Dear Reviewer #1,

Thank you for your valuable feedback on our manuscript, "Analysis of risk factors leading to anxiety and depression in patients with prostate cancer after castration and the construction of a risk prediction mode". We appreciate your recognition of the scientific quality, novelty, creativity, and significance of our study.

In response to your suggestion regarding the validation of the risk prediction model, we have included additional information about the SDS/SAS scores of the validation group, along with a detailed classification of the population. These additions provide a more comprehensive understanding of the validation process and strengthen the reliability of our risk prediction model.

Furthermore, we have included a section proposing future research directions. This section highlights potential areas for further investigation, emphasizing the importance of continuous research in this field to improve mental health support strategies for prostate cancer patients.

We believe these modifications address your concerns and enhance the manuscript's overall quality. We are grateful for your recommendation and look forward to the possibility of our manuscript's publication.

Reviewer #2:
Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)
Novelty of This Manuscript: Grade B (Good)
Creativity or Innovation of This Manuscript: Grade B (Good)
Scientific Significance of the Conclusion in This Manuscript: Grade B (Good)
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments To Authors: Postoperative anxiety and depression are common and serious psychological problems in patients with prostate cancer, and marital status. Li RX et al. conducted a retrospective study to investigate the relationship between various clinical factors and postoperative anxiety and depression in PC patients. In addition, the study aims to establish a prediction model using logistic regression analysis to evaluate the risk of adverse emotional outcomes of these patients. They found that marital status, castration scheme, and postoperative VAS score were identified to be important factors affecting postoperative anxiety and depression in PC patients. The study successfully identified the risk factors and developed a risk prediction model, there are still some limitations. The manuscript is very interesting and useful. The experiment of the study is designed very well, aims are very clear. Methods are reasonable. Data in figures are very good, and well discussed. Finally, the manuscript also reviewed previous related literature. I suggest adding tables to make some of the data picture more clear. Thank you for giving opportunity to review your study.

Dear Reviewer #2,

We are grateful for your thorough review and constructive feedback on our manuscript, "Analysis of risk factors leading to anxiety and depression in patients with prostate cancer after castration and the construction of a risk prediction mode". We appreciate your recognition of the study's design, clarity of aims, methodological rigor, and the comprehensive review of related literature.

In response to your suggestion, we have added a table comparing risk scores. This table presents the data in a more structured and comprehensible format, thereby enhancing the manuscript's clarity and aiding in the interpretation of our findings. The addition of this table ensures a clearer representation of the data, particularly in relation to the risk factors identified in our study.

We believe that these adjustments adequately address your recommendation

and improve the overall quality and readability of our manuscript. We are thankful for the opportunity to enhance our work based on your valuable input and look forward to the possibility of our study being published.

Sincerely,