

Response file

Reviewer 1

1) The general language of the manuscript can be improved over all.

Response: I request my friend who is a native English speaker also a public health researcher from Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center LA, US

2) Introduction section can be organized into concise paragraphs for better clarity.

Response: we try to make concise paragraph as you suggested.

3) Rationale of the study is not clear. Abstract 1) The duration of the study is not clear in the sentence ' A cross-sectional study was conducted at Bhaktapur Cancer Hospital in Kathmandu Valley among 220 cancer patients aged from 18 to 70 years from 1 July to 15 July 2022.'

Response: Both are right, but "1 July to 15 July 2022" is data collection duration and we remove it to eliminate confusion.

2) "Convenient sampling was used among patients by interview technique from the standard questionnaire Patient-Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9) for Depression and Hospital Anxiety and Depression sub-scale (HADS)for anxiety" The above sentence can be clearer to follow.

Response: Thank you, we rewrite as suggested by you.

Methods 1) Different study periods have been mentioned in the abstract and methods section." A cross-sectional and descriptive study was conducted among cancer patients attending Bhaktapur Cancer Hospital. The total study duration was April to September 2022"

Response: April to September 2022 was the total study duration including proposal development, ethical clearance tools development, data collection, analysis, initial manuscript writing and all activities.

2) Incorporation of association between the cancer type and psychiatric co-morbidities can improve the content of the manuscript. Discussion Repetition of sentences taken from other sections can be removed.

Response; we initially measure the association between different variable but it showed no association between depression and anxiety to sociodemographic and type and stage of cancer, so we remove that table.

Conclusions The authors should consider giving leads for future research in this area.

Response: Thank you for your words, we add one sentence like this: The authors are encouraged to provide opportunities for potential avenues of future research within this field.

Reviewer #2:

Specific Comments to Authors: The manuscript is interesting and presents scientific value, however, certain parts need to be revised:

1. all parts of the manuscript, including the abstract, need to be grammatically and semantically reviewed and proofread by a native speaker. Some sentences are not finite and lack logical coherence.

Response: I request my friend who is a native English speaker also a public health researcher from Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center LA, US

2. there are certain typos/ mistakes in how the manuscript is constructed (124(56.4%), 70(31.8%), and 3(1.3%) had mild, moderate, and severe depression respectively, and 35.9%, 29.1%, and 4(1.8%)).

Response: Thank you, we correct those mistakes

The beginning of the sentence shows both absolute numbers and proportions, whereas the last part has only proportions and one absolute number with proportion.

3. It is important to discuss what authors think on why depression level is higher than anxiety level, although commonly anxiety is more prevalent.

Response: We add it in discussion: we highlighted some sentence to clarify it: In addition, most of the patients were with II or III stage of cancer (36.4% and 42.7% of patients) in our study, which may be one of the reasons for the higher prevalence of depression.

Advanced stages of cancer might lead to increased psychological distress due to factors like increased symptom burden, more aggressive treatments, or decreased prognosis. But I got some literatures which shows higher level depression than anxiety please find some links:

1. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1876201813003092>
2. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.585534>
3. <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/rjmhs/article/view/186885>
4. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00520-013-1997-y>