

- 1) M.A Moreno et al (J of Depress Anxiety, 2011, 28(6) pp. 447–455) have shown statistical analysis using STATA. You use in Lines 456 – 465 is not the most appropriate for this situation. Please explain why you used this method. Also please explain where is your predicted and validated data set.
- 2) Your mathematical perspective needs more detail. I suggest that you improve the description at lines 32 – 34, 466 – 468 and 482 – 488 to provide more justification for your study.
- 3) I thank you for providing the raw data, however your supplemental files need more descriptive metadata identifier to be useful to future readers. Although your results are compelling, the data analysis should be improved in the following ways:
 - (a) In Figure 3 and data table 3 are controversial because you are saying data at 2020-2023 is 5200 research works but in figure 3 it is in reverse trend. Please correct it.
 - (b) In Line 420 and for Figure-4, there are 1300 words were selected from the examined papers, is there any specific reason to select these many words on what basis the frequency of the word is set, it has to be explained. Otherwise instead of 1300 words may be most important words (say 300 words) could be selected to show words frequency factor.
 - (c) Table 4 and Figure 6 reveals the same meaning so any one can be kept, most probably Table 4 is meaningful.
 - (d) Table 5 and Figure 7, how did you arrive % of categorical impact, which data point did you used for calculation please explain. The total percentage contribution /impact of all categories will be 100% or the summation should be up to 100%. Or otherwise either in row or column wise if you add it should come 100%.
 - (e) Effect of each category to be connected with human communal media.
 - (f) From the Figure 5 and Figure 6; it would be more appropriate to do curve fitting and have the regression equations and then use that equations for developing a model and then predict and then validate.
- 4) I praise the authors for their extensive data set, compiled over many years of detailed field work and real survey work. In addition, the manuscript is clearly written in professional, unambiguous language. If there is a weakness, it is in the mathematical analysis (as I have noted above) which should be improved upon before Acceptance.

Organize by importance of the issues, and number your points

1. *Your most important issue*
2. *The next most important item*
3. ...
4. *The least important points*

Please provide constructive criticism, and avoid personal opinions

I thank you for providing the raw data, however your supplemental files need more descriptive metadata identifiers to be useful to future readers. Although your results are compelling, the data analysis should be improved in the following ways: AA, BB, CC

Comment on strengths (as well as weaknesses) of the manuscript

I commend the authors for their extensive data set, compiled over many years of detailed fieldwork. In addition, the manuscript is clearly written in professional, unambiguous language. If there is a weakness, it is in the statistical analysis (as I have noted above) which should be improved upon before Acceptance.