Comments from the editors and reviewers:

We would like to thank the editor and the reviewers for the time they spent reviewing our paper and for the valuable comments they provided, which we believe helped us improve the paper and clarify some points that were not well explained in the previous version.

The editor informed us twice that there are some problems with the English language and some references, and therefore the language and the manuscript need to be improved. Accordingly, we first sought the help of a colleague who is an Associate Professor of English Linguistics and who is familiar with the subject matter of this manuscript, and we revised and updated the manuscript. Next, we conducted another careful review to check the entire manuscript, references, and direct quotations.

Our point-by-point responses to the reviewers' and editor's comments are as follows.

Reviewer 1: Yusuf Can Semerci

Basic reporting

I would like to thank the authors for addressing all my previous comments in this section.

I would, on the other hand, encourage the authors to perform a second thorough English check (spelling, duplicate etc.)

For example (lines in the new manuscript):

Line 231 "given by each given by each"

Line 232 "that word to the of that word"

We thank the reviewer for his valuable comments. The manuscript has been revised and proofread.

Validity of the findings

Regarding my previous comment "The study lacks discussion/information about the connection between the emotions selected for the dataset and depression (or other mental disorders) since depression is heavily mentioned at the beginning of the article and the connection is never made between these emotions and depression.":

I appraciate the new additions but it would be great to give a comment on which of the emotions are directly related to depression and how different models are performing at recognizing these emotions.

We thank the reviewer for his valuable comments. We believe that his recommendations have improved the overall quality of the paper.

Regarding my previous comment "The authors claim that there are significant improvements but statistical tests supporting these claims are not presented. In order to claim significant differences, statistical data analysis should be performed (e.g., T-Test)."
I appraciate the explanation provided by the authors on the statistical analysis and why it is a limitation. On the other hand, the text still contains the same claim the the improvements are significant (line 496, line 534). I believe that in order to use the word "significant" for an outcome

Thanks to the reviewer for pointing this out. We have deleted the word "significant" from lines 496 and 534.

Reviewer 2 (Kin Wai Ng Lugo)

Basic reporting

Sufficient.

Experimental design

Sufficient.

Validity of the findings

Sufficient and proved.

Additional comments

I want to thank the authors for the effort made in their manuscript revision. The rebuttal letter was detailed and it addressed the concerns I had with the initial version of the paper. Overall, the paper is clear and meets the standards for the journal

We thank the reviewer for his valuable comments. We believe that his recommendations have improved the overall quality of the paper.