Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

Dear Reviewer,

We are truly grateful to the editors for coordinating the review of our manuscript and to the reviewers for their insightful and constructive comments. By making thorough and careful revisions to the manuscript based on the reviewers' comments, we believe that this manuscript has been greatly improved. Our point-by-point responses to the comments of the reviewers are listed below. The new changes in the revised manuscript are marked in blue.

Point 1: While comprehensive, methodological transparency needs to be be improved by explicitly detailing the criteria for literature selection and synthesis methodologies. And this is my only major comment for article revision.

Response 1: Thanks for your valuable suggestions. We have included additional details regarding the criteria for literature selection and synthesis methodologies into our manuscript. The relevant paragraph has been extracted from the manuscript.

Page 4, line 177-185: “In this study, we mainly focus on patients (adults) diagnosed with MDD to illustrate the abnormal arousal in depression. We conducted a comprehensive search in the Web of Science for articles published up to November 2023, with terms: “MDD AND ("heart rate" OR "Heart rate variability" OR "pupil" OR "skin conductance" OR "electrodermal activity")”; “MDD AND HPA”; “MDD AND locus coeruleus AND norepinephrine”; “MDD AND EEG vigilance”. Articles resulting from these searches and relevant references cited in those articles were thoroughly reviewed for this research, and this selection was also completed by searches in the authors’ personal files, where articles published in English were included. ”