

Answering reviewers

#1

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Sir, I read with interest the manuscript entitled "Study on the effect of exercise prescription teaching on the exercise quality and mental health status of college students". The manuscript is well designed and written. The methods of data analysis are very clear, and the results are presented well. However, some issues have to be addressed: 1. It needs to be clarified in the Methods section of the study that all participants signed an informed consent form and that the study was approved by an ethics committee; 2. Please enrich the contents of the figure. Each small figure needs to be described separately. In addition, please explain the meaning of * equal symbol in the column diagram; 3. Limitations of the study need to be supplemented; 4. I noted 142 boys and 98 girls in the study. Is there a comparison of exercise prescription teaching between different genders? Please add if relevant results. Thank you for giving the opportunity to review this manuscript. If the author modifies the above, this manuscript can be published.

#2

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript analyzed the effect of exercise prescription teaching on the exercise quality and mental health status of college students. The physical condition and psychological and mental health problems of contemporary college students are prominent. Although the idea of the study is not novel enough, however, the manuscript is well written: the title reflects the main subject of the article, abstract and keywords well summarize the arguments. The methodology is described in detail and is well structured. Data were extracted from the exercise quality, body morphology, cardiopulmonary function and mental health status to understand the effects of the exercise prescription teaching mode on students' physical and mental health status. The discussion is well articulated according to results. A point that can be improved in this

article is that the authors should clearly underlined the limitations and drawbacks of the manuscript. The manuscript cites appropriately the latest and authoritative references. Reading the manuscript some minor concerns have emerged: • '3.2' on page 12 should be '3.3', and 'as shown in Table 1' in line 12 on page 5 should be 'Table 2', and 'Table 2' in line 3 on page 8 should be 'Table 3'. •It is recommended to add more discussion on the limitations and drawbacks in the discussion section.

Reply1: Thank you for your comments on the manuscript, there are some limitations and drawbacks of the study, which we have added in the "Summary". In addition, we have corrected the incorrect serial numbers accordingly, At the same time, some optimizations and improvements have also been made to parts of the manuscript, as detailed in the revised section of the article.

Reply: Thank you for your comments on the manuscript.

1.This revised version has been now supplemented with ethical information and consent status in the methods section as required.

2. This revised version now includes a separate description of each figure, as required, and an explanation of the symbols in the bar chart.

3.This revised version has been now supplemented with the limitations of this study in the summary section as required.

4. In this modified version, we performed statistical analysis of baseline data including gender, age, height, and weight for both groups of students, which were tested to be comparable with $P < 0.05$, and these have now been added to the methods section.