OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Open Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:
https://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Health Scope
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/jhealthscope-127242
Published in: Health Scope: 11(3); e127242

Peer Review Report for "Investigating Internet Addiction and Sleep Quality Correlation Among Students of Isfahan University of Medical Sciences in 2021"

Author(s): Mohammad Javad Tarrahi, Mahdi Rezaei Kahkha Zhaleh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 1 May 2022
Revised Date: 17 Jul 2022
Accepted Date: 2 Aug 2022

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Hossein Ansari: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 23 May 2022

Thanks to the author, please make the following corrections:
1. Do not start the sentence with “and” in line 13 of the Methods sections or other sentences.
2. In Line 16 This sentence is repetitive:” All participants mentioned their satisfaction before taking part in the study” (Mentioned in line 9).
3. In the Research Instrument section, because the questionnaires are standard, they do not need a detailed explanation. Make this section much more concise.
4. In the result section, the associations are very numerous and confusing. It is suggested that you associate the quality of sleep, which is a dependent variable, with other variables, either quantitatively or qualitatively, and finally use a type of regression (linear or logistic). Please summarize the Statistical analysis section (lines 6 to 16).
Due to the changes in the results, the discussion section should also be modified

Fatemeh Zargar: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 7 Jun 2022

the comments entered in the manuscript. so the manuscript was uploaded with the comments.

Mojtaba Akbari: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 11 Jun 2022

While thanking you for the very valuable and useful study that has been done, I would like to suggest some points as follows:
1. In general, the volume of the manuscript is long and it can be shortened in a more concise way without damaging the scientific content and results.
2. The sentence structure of the manuscript needs serious revisions. Please review the abstract and body of the manuscript to correct spelling mistakes, type, and punctuations.
3. Mentioning the title of the study as a Cross-sectional study is sufficient. Please delete the term descriptive-analytical.
4. Please use multiple regression instead of Multivariate regression in the body of the manuscript.
5. Please use Beta (β) instead of B in the result tables.
6. Please use the same format to write the desired items everywhere in the manuscript, ie: ANOVA (Capital letters) and so on.
7. In the results tables, there is no need to repeat “P” in the relevant part of P-value.

Hossein Ansari: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 12 Jun 2022

First reviewer’s comments
While thanking you for the very valuable and useful study that has been done, I would like to suggest some points as follows:
1. In general, the volume of the manuscript is long and it can be shortened in a more concise way without damaging the scientific content and results.
2 The sentence structure of the manuscript needs serious revisions. Please review the abstract and body of the manuscript to correct spelling mistakes, type, and punctuation
3. Mentioning the title ofthe study as a Cross-sectional study is sufficient. Please delete the term descriptive-analytical.
4. Please use multiple regression instead of Multivariate regression in the body of the manuscript.
5. Please use Beta (β) instead of B in the result tables.
6. Please use the same format to write the desired items everywhere in the manuscript, ie: ANOVA (Capital letters) and so on.
7. In the results tables, there is no need to repeat “P” in the relevant part of P-value.
Second reviewer’s comments
Thanks to the author, please make the following corrections:
1. Do not start the sentence with “and” in line 13 of the Methods sections or other sentences.
2. In Line 16 This sentence is repetitive:” All participants mentioned their satisfaction before taking part in the study” (Mentioned in line 9).
3. In the Research Instrument section, because the questionnaires are standard, they do not need a detailed explanation. Make this section much more concise.
4. In the result section, the associations are very numerous and confusing. It is suggested that you associate the quality of sleep, which is a dependent variable, with other variables,

either quantitatively or qualitatively, and finally use a type of regression (linear or logistic).
Please summarize the Statistical analysis section (lines 6 to 16).
Due to the changes in the results, the discussion section should also be modified

Third reviewer comments

1. In the introduction, content before Internet addiction should be related to this topic. Internet addiction has suddenly been raised
2. In the introduction section on line 8, a new variable is introduced without any previous preamble and connection with the previous variable. While the variable of Internet addiction is written in one line and suddenly dropped and the variable of sleep quality is introduced
3. There is no need to write about hormones
4. In the eleventh line this sentence is incomplete. Content related to a variable does not fit properly. Suddenly the introduction abruptly interrupted and again mentioned elsewhere in the text. Hence the coherence of the text is very poor
5. In the sixteenth line of the Internet, there is no specific name that requires capital writing. Also, sentences and writing need serious editing and the sentences are constantly repeated
6. The definition of Internet addiction has not been addressed, and the effects of Internet addiction and its mechanism of action on sleep have not been addressed
7. The quality of sleep is not defined, research related to the subject of research is not provided and the need for this special study is not specified
8. Delete lines 30 to 32 because it is given in the objectives item
9. The wording of materials and methods needs serious editing
10. In line 38, specify the range to the month
11. In line 40, does the author refer to all students?
12. How many questions did not complete lead to the exit?
13. How is psychiatric illness assessed? What self-report questionnaire was used to do this?
14. What are the inclusion criteria?
15. The full name of the questionnaire and abbreviates should be mentioned first
16. Psychometric properties of the original and Persian versions should be written
17. In Table 1, were all the samples female? Were they all single?
18. What was the need to use two methods of regression analysis and ANOVA?

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision (0)** 29 Jun 2022

Dear Author
Thanks for submitting your valuable manuscript to the journal. As a result of this, we would like to inform you that the review of your manuscript is finished, and based on the editorial decision, you need to do a "Major Revision" on your manuscript. Even though this manuscript has enough quality to enter the review process, it needs some significant (major) revisions in some points of view.
Best Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Greetings and greetings serve the professors of the precious referee

Thank you for your comments and recommendations.

First reviewer's comments

1. In general, the volume of the manuscript is long and it can be shortened in a more concise way without damaging the scientific content and results.

Thanks to the honorable referee master

It was tried to reduce the volume of the article as much as possible while maintaining the quality of the presentation.

2.The sentence structure of the manuscript needs serious revisions. Please review the abstract and body of the manuscript to correct spelling mistakes, typo, and punctuations.

Thanks to the honorable referee master

The structure of sentences, incomplete sentences and the terminology of words were revised and modified.

Mentioning the title of the study as a Cross-sectional study is sufficient. Please delete the term descriptive-analytical.

Thanks to the honorable referee master

The term was omitted on page 2 of line 12.

4. Please use multiple regression instead of Multivariate regression in the body of the manuscript

Thanks to the honorable referee master

Your recommendation was taken into consideration and applied in the whole text.

5. Please use Beta (β) instead of B in the result tables.

Thanks to the honorable referee master

Your recommendation was taken into consideration and used in pages 6 of Table 3 and Page 7 of Table 4.

6. Please use the same format to write the desired items everywhere in the manuscript, ie: ANOVA (Capital letters) and so on.

Thanks to the honorable referee master

Your recommendation was taken into consideration and applied in the whole text(For example: the word ANOVA on page 6 line 1).

7. In the results tables, there is no need to repeat "P" in the relevant part of P-value.

Thanks to the honorable referee master

Tables 2, 3 and 4 were modified.

Second reviewer's comments

Do not start the sentence with "and" in line 13 of the Methods sections or other .1 .sentences

Thanks to the honorable referee master

Your recommendation was taken into consideration and applied in the whole text(Page 6 line 3).

2. In Line 16 This sentence is repetitive:" All participants mentioned their satisfaction before taking part in the study" (Mentioned in the line 9).

Thanks to the honorable referee master

Line 16 was removed according to your recommendation.

3. In the Research Instrument section, because the questionnaires are standard, they do not need a detailed explanation. Make this section much more concise.

Thanks to the honorable referee master

According to your recommendation, additional explanations were avoided and summarized as much as possible.

4. In the result section, the associations are very numerous and confusing. It is suggested that you associate the quality of sleep, which is a dependent variable, with other variables, either quantitatively or qualitatively, and finally use a type of regression (linear or logistic).Please summarize Statistical analysis section (lines 6 to 16).
Due to the changes in the results, the discussion section should also be modified

Thanks to the honorable referee master

The results were revisited and the information obtained from this study was more systematically placed in the text and the required results were placed with logistic regression with a logical order.

Third reviewer's comments

1. In the introduction, content before Internet addiction should be related to this topic. Internet addiction has suddenly been raised

Thanks to the honorable referee master

The introduction was thoroughly reviewed and the sequence of the contents was corrected.

2. In the introduction section on line 8, a new variable is introduced without any previous preamble and connection with the previous variable. While the variable of Internet addiction is written in one line and suddenly dropped and the variable of sleep quality is introduced

Thanks to the honorable referee master

The introduction was thoroughly reviewed and incomplete and missing sentences were completed.

3. There is no need to write about hormones

Thanks to the honorable referee master

The desired content according to your opinion is the removal of the grid.

4. In the eleventh line this sentence is incomplete. Content related to a variable does not fit properly. Suddenly the introduction, abruptly interrupted and again mentioned elsewhere in the text. Hence the coherence of the text is very poor

Thanks to the honorable referee master

The introduction was thoroughly reviewed and incomplete and missing sentences were completed and the relationship between variables was written based on the studies.

5. In the sixteenth line of the Internet, there is no specific name that requires capital writing. Also, sentence and writing need serious editing and the sentences are constantly repeated

Thanks to the honorable referee master

Re-writing reforms were made and such cases were amended.

6. The definition of Internet addiction has not been addressed, the effects of Internet addiction and its mechanism of action on sleep have not been addressed

Thanks to the honorable referee master

Definition of Internet addiction and the relationship between "sleep quality" was included in the text .

7. The quality of sleep is not defined, research related to the subject of research is not provided and the need for this special study is not specified

Thanks to the honorable referee master

Materials related to sleep quality were included and the necessity of conducting the study was mentioned at the end of the introduction.

8. Delete lines 30 to 32 because it is given in the objectives item

Thanks to the honorable referee master

Lines 30 to 32 were removed.

9. The wording of materials and methods needs serious editing

Thanks to the honorable referee master

This section was revised.

10. In line 38, specify the range to the month

Thanks to the honorable referee master

The date of data collection was mentioned on page 2 of line 14.

11. In line 40, does the author refer to all students?

Thanks to the honorable referee master

The study population was identified on page 2 of line 17.

12. How many questions did not complete lead to the exit?

Considering the consent of the participants to complete the questionnaire and the fact that the questionnaire is online, all the questions are mandatory and all the participants completed the questions until the end.

13. How is psychiatric illness assessed? What self-report questionnaire was used to do this?

Thanks to the honorable referee master.

Because the purpose of this study was not to assess the mental state of the subjects and since the questionnaires were provided online to the participants, only the answers of the subjects at the

beginning of the study on the question "whether they have any levels of mental disorders" were used to display or not to display the next questions and the subjects were excluded from the study.

14. What are the inclusion criteria?

Thanks to the honorable referee master

Inclusion criteria were shown on page 2 of lines 17 to 19.

15. The full name of the questionnaire and abbreviated should be mentioned first

Thanks to the honorable referee master

The full name of the questionnaire was given at the first mention in the text(Page 3 Lines 7 and 8).
.

16. Psychometric properties of the original and Persian versions should be written

Thanks to the honorable referee master

Internal validity of Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index which was evaluated for the first time in 1989 and its internal evaluation in Iran, was given on page 3 of lines 14-16..

17. In Table 1, were all the samples female? Were they all single?

Thanks to the honorable referee master

Gender profiles for men and women were included in the table.

18. What was the need to use two methods of regression analysis and ANOVA?

Thanks to the honorable referee master

Anova was used to assess sleep quality and its components among internet addiction levels and logistic regression was used to determine the predictive role of Internet addiction and its subgroups among sleep quality levels. Multiple linear regression was removed due to lack of necessity.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Hossein Ansari: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 24 Jul 2022

The authors have revised the manuscript based on the reviewers' comments.

Fatemeh Zargar: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 1 Aug 2022

The authors have revised the article according to my recommendations. The article is approved.

Hossein Ansari: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 1 Aug 2022

The authors have revised the manuscript based on the reviewers comments.

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 2 Aug 2022

Dear Author
According to reviewer comments, we congratulate to inform you that your article has been accepted for publication in this journal and we thank you for trusting us. As an expert in the field, you are best placed to explain why your article is exciting or impactful to a broader so if you fulfill your other commitments in a timely manner, your article will be published in this journal at the appointed time.
Kind regards