



Kellerwessel klaus <kellerwesselklaus@gmail.com>

Scientific Reports: Decision on your manuscript

1 üzenet

Scientific Reports <srep@nature.com>
Címzett: kellerwesselklaus@gmail.com

2025. április 23. 3:21

Ref: Submission ID 64f3e03e-796a-4c4f-a03c-a1d9dd5ebb7a

Dear Dr Kellerwessel,

Re: "Prediction of depression risk based on AI art prompts"

We are pleased to let you know that your manuscript has now passed through the review stage and is ready for revision. Many manuscripts require a round of revisions, so this is a normal but important stage of the editorial process.

Editor comments

According to the feedback received, your paper needs to be reconsidered after a revision.
I invite you to prepare a revision of the paper that carefully addresses all the comments raised.

To ensure the Editor and Reviewers will be able to recommend that your revised manuscript is accepted, please pay careful attention to each of the comments that have been pasted underneath this email. This way we can avoid future rounds of clarifications and revisions, moving swiftly to a decision.

Once you have addressed each comment and completed each step listed below, the revised submission and final file can be uploaded via the link below.

If you completed the initial submission, please log in using the same email address. If you did not complete the initial submission, please discuss with the submitting author, who will be able to access the link and resubmit.

<https://submission.springernature.com/submit-revision/64f3e03e-796a-4c4f-a03c-a1d9dd5ebb7a>

You can visit <https://researcher.nature.com/your-submissions> to track progress of this or any other submissions you might have.

CHECKLIST FOR SUBMITTING YOUR REVISION

1. Please upload a point-by-point response to the comments, including a description of any additional experiments that were carried out and a detailed rebuttal of any criticisms or requested revisions that you disagreed with. This must be uploaded as a 'Point-by-point response to reviewers' file.

You'll find a handy one-page PDF on how to respond to reviewers' comments here:

https://www.nature.com/documents/Effective_Response_To_Reviewers-1.pdf

2. Please highlight all the amends on your manuscript or indicate them by using tracked changes.

3. Check the format for revised manuscripts in our submission guidelines, making sure you pay particular attention to the figure resolution requirements:

<https://www.nature.com/srep/publish/guidelines>

Finally, if you have been asked to improve the language or presentation of your manuscript and would like the assistance of paid editing services, then our expert help at Springer Nature Author Services can help you improve your manuscript through services including English language editing, developmental comments, manuscript formatting, figure preparation, translation, and more.

To find out more and get 15% off your order then click the link below.

https://authorservices.springernature.com/go/sn/?utm_source=SNAPP&utm_medium=Revision+Email&utm_campaign=SNAS+Referrals+2022&utm_id=ref2022

Please note that use of an editing service is neither a requirement nor a guarantee of publication. Free assistance is available from our resources page: <https://www.springernature.com/gp/researchers/campaigns/english-language-forauthors>

To support the continuity of the peer review process, we recommend returning your manuscript to us within 14 days. If you think you will need additional time, please let us know and we will aim to respond within 48 hours.

Kind regards,

Riccardo Ortale
Editorial Board Member
Scientific Reports

Reviewer Comments:

Reviewer 1

I have no further comments on the work, the authors addressed the concerns in the revision.

Reviewer 2

The new revision addressed my concerns, I recommend its acceptance.

Reviewer 3

Thank you for the invitation to review this article. While I understand from the submission history that there have been revisions before, I see my role as a new reviewer not in referring to those but in providing a new and unbiased opinion, which I will provide in the following review.

The paper predicts depression scores from midjourney prompts in a sample of around 200 people. This is a refreshing idea, presented by the author in elegant writing. I also appreciate that the author shared a major part of the used dataset on HF. I have some methodical questions as well as some points that I believe could be strengthened. Point 7 is the most important to me, because the claim that SMOTE biases the results is also made in the abstract. In my view, this would only be true if there were a major methodological mistake—specifically, if SMOTE had been applied to the entire dataset instead of only to the training data.

1. I think the value proposition could be made clearer. How does the author imagine such an approach being used within routine care? The challenge in diagnosing depression in comorbid cases is briefly mentioned in the abstract as well as the introduction, but not explained in enough detail.
2. I am not convinced by the idea of speaking of “risk of depression” instead of depression. Can you cite resources where this approach is taken as well? Any reason why you do not speak of “depressive symptoms”?
3. I expected the code to be in the supplement (“supplement 8”) but was not able to find it. please share the whole used code in a publicly accessible repository (e.g. github). This is crucial to allow reproducibility and benefit open science.
4. You are losing me for a minute at the roberta model. Why are you predicting sentiment, if, in my understanding, the predictive task you are trying to achieve is classification of depression scores?
5. Even after reading the results later I can not make sense out of that. Can you possibly extend your argument why you are taking this in-between step instead of directly predicting your outcome of interest?
6. Did you consider just predicting the depression scores out of the used words as a baseline, if you wanna prove that the use of the heavy roberta model is actually providing value?
7. “However, it is important to interpret these results cautiously. This substantial improvement is likely influenced by the significantly increased class imbalance caused by the stricter cutoff and the resulting reliance on SMOTE oversampling, which can introduce artificial patterns into the data. “ Wait - you applied SMOTE not on the whole dataset but always on the train part, within e.g. a Pipeline, right? then this argument does not make sense and the improvement is valid. If you did not do that this is a major methodical error. Please share a) your thoughts and b) your code!
8. I have several open questions on the classifier.
 - a. how high was the variation when running a 10kfold classifier repeatedly for the same model choice? please report this somewhere. particularly in sample sizes that small there can be easily variations from 0.6 to 0.8 just by the random initiation of parameters in a random forest. this makes any performance estimates a bit unreliable. this should at least be reported.
 - b. related to this: how did you selected the “best performing algorithm”? Any reason why you did not used a significance test here when claiming a superior performance of the RF?
 - c. the accuracy was calculated on the default threshold of 0.5 and no tuning was done, right?

d. what hyperparameters did you tuned and how? what parameter did you optimized for?

9. I think the author is wasting potential in not utilizing any explainability methods. It would be quite helpful to understand e.g. what words had the highest predictive value for depression scores. Please either add an explainability part or provide a convincing argument why you do not see this being relevant.

10. "The compiled database contains over 32,000 images, providing a rich resource for further analysis" what database are you speaking about? i must have missed this connection