IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Volume 17 · Issue 3 · e83102

OPEN PEER REVIEW

# Family Social Capital Among Adolescents that Are Users and Non-users of Social Media

Narjes Geraee, Ahmad Ali Eslami

| SUBMITTED | REVISED | ACCEPTED | DOI |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11 Aug 2018 | 16 Jan 2022 | 24 Jun 2023 | 10.5812/ijpbs-83102 |

## About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

## Contents

1 Original submission ..... 2
2 Revision 1 ..... 3
Authors' reply to reviewers ..... 4
Reviewer and editor comments ..... 17
3 Revision 2 Referee 1, Editor-in-Chief ..... 18
Authors' reply to reviewers ..... 19
Reviewer and editor comments ..... 22
4 Revision 3 Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief ..... 23
Authors' reply to reviewers ..... 24
Reviewer and editor comments ..... 27

## 1 Original submission

0 comments

*No public comments in this round.*

2

# Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

## Response to Reviewers

Manuscript ID: 83102

Manuscript title: "Family Social Capital in Adolescents that are Users and Non-Users of Social Media: a Comparative Study"

We would like to thank the reviewers for their thoughtful review of the manuscript. They raise important issues and their inputs are very helpful for improving the manuscript. We agree with almost all their comments and we have revised our manuscript accordingly.

We respond below in detail to each of the reviewer's comments. In addition, we include how we have revised things, or if we have slightly disagreed with something, we stated why. We hope that the reviewers will find our responses to their comments satisfactory, and we are willing to finish the revised version of the manuscript including any further suggestion that the reviewers may have.

Please, find below the reviewers' comments in ***italics***, the authors' responses in purple, the corrected Sentences as well as the sentences added to the manuscript in "quotation marks" and red.

Looking forward hearing from you soon.
Sincerely,
The Authors

## Response to comments from Reviewer 1:

We would like to thank the reviewer for careful and thorough reading of this manuscript and for the thoughtful comments and constructive suggestions, which help to improve the quality of this manuscript. Our response follows:

- ***There is not time and exact place of research in abstract***

Necessary changes have been made and this section is now rewritten as follows:

"In a cross-sectional study using stratified, two stages, cluster sampling, the data were collected from 3600 adolescents between 12-19 years in Isfahan, Iran. Participants were surveyed in January–March 2017 and recruited from schools. Family social capital was assessed using a questionnaire with adequate validity and reliability."

- ***methods: time and exact place of research did not mentioned***
- ***How they access the population (schools .....)***

Necessary changes have been made and this section is now rewritten as follows:

"The data was gathered from 3600 adolescents between the ages of 12-19 in a cross-sectional study in Isfahan, Iran. Participants were recruited from schools throughout Isfahan, using both stratified and random cluster sampling, in January–March 2017. The sample was first stratified by socioeconomic class, and then was stratified by gender. The socioeconomic classification reference was a study classifying the population of Isfahan to the three classes of well-supplied, moderately supplied, and under-supplied(18). A total number of 3655 adolescents were invited to participate in the study. Of them, 3600 adolescents participated. Participants completed a pencil and paper questionnaire and were informed about the participation and completion being completely voluntary. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee and Research Deputy of Isfahan University of Medical Sciences."

- ***There are not any information about the number of users and nonusers in different socioeconomic status***

The following sentences have been included:

"The percentages of the users belonging to the low- supplied, moderately-supplied, and well-supplied classes were 35, 31, and 34 respectively. The Kruskal-Wallis test indicated no statistically meaningful difference in user frequency among the three socioeconomic classes."

- ***discussion: the differences between results in different researches are not discussed***

The discussion section focusing on the main variables of the study has been changed and re- written as follows:

"The results indicated that more than 76 percent of the adolescents participating in the study were users of social media. This is above the overall percentage of cell phone ownership in Asian adolescents, which is 62 percent(19).

It has been shown that there are gender-based differences in usage amount, usage type, usage reasons, and the type and amount of vulnerability in the adolescents' use of social media(20-22). Contrary to some studies reporting that females are more active in social media(22), the findings of this study indicated that males had a higher membership rate in social media, which is in line with the findings of Xin et al. (2017), that indicated the higher internet use among males than females(20). According to the results of this study, the mean scores for family conflicts and family monitoring were higher in female users. In line with the results of this study, a study by Ahmadi (2015) also showed meaningful gender-based difference in family monitoring over males and females, as females are under stronger family monitoring, and parents show more sensitivity and concerns in maintaining rule over female children(23).

While Saeed Khan et al. (2016) indicated that motives for using internet are to some extent determined by the socioeconomic status of users, and their position in social structure(24), this study showed no difference in the frequency of adolescent users among the three socioeconomic classes. This can be attributed to accessibility, ease of use, and relatively low

costs of these media. After further investigation on users according to their socioeconomic status, the results indicated higher family cohesion and family monitoring in the higher socioeconomic classes. These findings indicate the significance of family's socioeconomic status regarding the manifestation of some aspects of family social capital. In line with the results of this study, Zhang (2012) and Banovcinova et al. (2014) have reported the higher family cohesion in families of higher socioeconomic levels (25, 26).

Although some studies suggest that using social media increases the effectiveness of communication between the family members and facilitates family monitoring (16, 17, 27), Results of this study indicated higher values for overall family social capital and all dimensions of family social capital in non-user adolescents. In other words, adolescents who did not use these media reported higher family interactions, family cohesion, and family monitoring, and less family conflicts.

These results are in line with the findings of Nie and Hillygus (2002) who reported that internet use at home has strong negative effects on the time spent with family members(13). Lee's study (2009) also showed a negative relationship between the time dedicated to online relationships, and the time dedicated to parents(11). An online survey by Vitak et al. (2011) indicated that due to the shift of social media from enhancing close ties towards forming relationships with strangers and establishing various groups; people currently use social media primarily for establishing weak ties, which means a low bonding social capital for the users of social media(28). Studies conducted by Wang et al. (2011), Yan et al. (2014), and Snyder et al. (2015), were also reported a negative relationship between the use of social media and the components of family social capital(14, 29, 30).

Chen et al. (2016) argue that these inconsistent findings are due to the exclusion of the usage type, stating that users must be divided into the two active and passive groups(31). Therefore, in addition to dividing the participants into two groups of users and non-users; investigating the usage patterns of the users is also necessary."

- ***there is not any new question at the end***

The following sentences have been included in the discussion section:

"…….Chen et al. (2016) argue that these inconsistent findings are due to the exclusion of the usage type, stating that users must be divided into the two active and passive groups(31). Therefore, in addition to dividing the participants into two groups of users and non-users; investigating the usage patterns of the users is also necessary."

- ***did not mention any clinical application***

The conclusion section has been modified as follows:

"Our findings showed that a great percentage of adolescents were users of social media, and all dimensions of family social capital were better in non-user adolescents. Considering the increasing trend of social media usage among adolescents, it is important to develop interventions specially media literacy education, to reduce usage time, and to protect adolescents against potential destructive effects of these media."

- ***limitation did not point***

The limitations section has been added to the manuscript as follows:

*"5.2. Limitations*

This study only investigated whether the adolescents were users or non-users of social media. Since the use of social media includes systematic patterns in which a specific medium can be used for different purposes, while also different media can be used for identical purposes, we recommend that future studies take this matter into account."

**Response to comments from Reviewer 2:**

We would like to thank the reviewer for careful and thorough reading of this manuscript and for the thoughtful comments and constructive suggestions, which help to improve the quality of this manuscript. Our response follows:

- ***Please declare opposite and negative points in other studies in comparing with present study in the background.***

The reviewer is right in that we did not include many details regarding the previous studies and conflicting data in introduction section. It is worth noting that, following the word count limit law, it was not possible to further expand these points in the introduction section. However, the following sentences have been added to the introduction section, and in the discussion section, the findings of the study have been discussed in more details:

"There are contradictory studies about the influence of social media usage on the quantity and quality of family relationships; whereas some studies report negative influences, others report the opposite (9, 12, 13). In other words, some argue that social media have an overall negative effect on family social capital components. In particular, these studies suggest that social media usage reduces the time dedicated to family, and there is a negative relationship between these two variables (14, 15). In contrast, others argue that social media have a positive effect on family social capital components. In particular, these studies suggest that social media can help family members communicate efficiently(16), and can also increase parenting efficacy(17). A primary cause of these contradictions is the absence of a study which compares users and non-users."

- ***mix table 3&4***

Table 3 was about the mean scores of family social capital dimensions among **gender groups**, and Table 4 was about the mean scores of family social capital dimensions among **socioeconomic classes**; integrating them might lead to a misunderstanding for readers. However, in order to avoid prolonging Table 4, reporting the results of this table were modified as follows:

Table 4. Means, standard deviations, and statistically significant differences among the three study groups

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| variables | under-supplied | moderately supplied | well-supplied | F | Significance of difference between groups |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | | |
| Family Cohesion | 4.00 (79.) | 4.09 (71.) | 4.08 (71.) | *4.64 | 1-2; 2<br>1-3; 3 |
| Family Interaction | 3.60 (80.) | 3.64 (78.) | 3.66 (76.) | 1.52 | - |
| Family Conflict | 3.59 (97.) | 3.60 (95.) | 3.61 (93.) | 11. | - |
| Family Monitoring | 4.24 (86.) | 4.27 (81.) | 4.34 (75.) | *3.71 | 1-3; 3 |
| Total family social capital | 3.86 (67.) | 3.90 (62.) | 3.92 (62.) | *2.70 | 1-3; 3 |

****p<.05*

- ***write analytical test below each table***

The following sentences have been included:

According to Table 2, The two-sample t-test showed that, there were meaningful differences in the mean scores of family cohesion, family interactions, family conflicts, family monitoring, and total family social……

According to Table 3, The two-sample t-test showed that, there was no difference between the male and female users in the mean values of the variables of family cohesion and family interactions (sig > 0.05). However, there were differences between the male and female users in the variables of ……..

The difference in family social capital among users from the three socioeconomic classes examined using one-way variance analysis (ANOVA). …….. Post hoc tests were used to determine the quality of difference. But before that, the equality of variances test was performed, and the Levene's test indicated that the"sig" value was less than 0.05 for all three

mentioned variables. Thus, the condition for equality of variances was not met. Therefore, the Games-Howell post hoc test was used.

- ***compare your results with other studies in discussion section***

The discussion section focusing on the main variables of the study has been changed and re- written as follows:

"The results indicated that more than 76 percent of the adolescents participating in the study were users of social media. This is above the overall percentage of cell phone ownership in Asian adolescents, which is 62 percent(19).

It has been shown that there are gender-based differences in usage amount, usage type, usage reasons, and the type and amount of vulnerability in the adolescents' use of social media(20-22). Contrary to some studies reporting that females are more active in social media(22), the findings of this study indicated that males had a higher membership rate in social media, which is in line with the findings of Xin et al. (2017), that indicated the higher internet use among males than females(20). According to the results of this study, the mean scores for family conflicts and family monitoring were higher in female users. In line with the results of this study, a study by Ahmadi (2015) also showed meaningful gender-based difference in family monitoring over males and females, as females are under stronger family monitoring, and parents show more sensitivity and concerns in maintaining rule over female children(23).

While Saeed Khan et al. (2016) indicated that motives for using internet are to some extent determined by the socioeconomic status of users, and their position in social structure(24), this study showed no difference in the frequency of adolescent users among the three socioeconomic classes. This can be attributed to accessibility, ease of use, and relatively low costs of these media. After further investigation on users according to their socioeconomic status, the results indicated higher family cohesion and family monitoring in the higher socioeconomic classes. These findings indicate the significance of family's socioeconomic status regarding the manifestation of some aspects of family social capital. In line with the results of this study, Zhang (2012) and Banovcinova et al. (2014) have reported the higher family cohesion in families of higher socioeconomic levels (25, 26).

Although some studies suggest that using social media increases the effectiveness of communication between the family members and facilitates family monitoring (16, 17, 27), Results of this study indicated higher values for overall family social capital and all dimensions of family social capital in non-user adolescents. In other words, adolescents who did not use these media reported higher family interactions, family cohesion, and family monitoring, and less family conflicts.

These results are in line with the findings of Nie and Hillygus (2002) who reported that internet use at home has strong negative effects on the time spent with family members(13). Lee's study (2009) also showed a negative relationship between the time dedicated to online

relationships, and the time dedicated to parents(11). An online survey by Vitak et al. (2011) indicated that due to the shift of social media from enhancing close ties towards forming relationships with strangers and establishing various groups; people currently use social media primarily for establishing weak ties, which means a low bonding social capital for the users of social media(28). Studies conducted by Wang et al. (2011), Yan et al. (2014), and Snyder et al. (2015), were also reported a negative relationship between the use of social media and the components of family social capital(14, 29, 30).

Chen et al. (2016) argue that these inconsistent findings are due to the exclusion of the usage type, stating that users must be divided into the two active and passive groups(31). Therefore, in addition to dividing the participants into two groups of users and non-users; investigating the usage patterns of the users is also necessary."

- ***check all references***

All references were re-checked and corrected

**Response to comments from Reviewer 3:**

*Dear author*
*I found the subject interesting but I think some revisions are needed in the paper:*

We appreciate the positive feedback from the reviewer and we would like to thank the reviewer for careful and thorough reading of this manuscript and for the thoughtful comments and constructive suggestions, which help to improve the quality of this manuscript. Our response follows:

- ***Time and place of the study should be mentioned in the title in cross sectional studies.***

The title has been modified as follows:

Family Social Capital among Adolescents that are Users and Non-Users of Social Media in Isfahan in 2017

- ***Introduction is written weakly. More details about previous studies and conflicting data in this area could be helpful.***

The reviewer is right in that we did not include many details regarding the previous studies and conflicting data in introduction section. It is worth noting that, following the word count limit law, it was not possible to further expand these points in the introduction section. However, the following sentences have been added to the introduction section, and in the discussion section, the findings of the study have been discussed in more details:

"There are contradictory studies about the influence of social media usage on the quantity and quality of family relationships; whereas some studies report negative influences, others report the opposite (9, 12, 13). In other words, some argue that social media have an overall negative effect on family social capital components. In particular, these studies suggest that social media usage reduces the time dedicated to family, and there is a negative relationship between these two variables (14, 15). In contrast, others argue that social media have a positive effect on family social capital components. In particular, these studies suggest that social media can help family members communicate efficiently(16), and can also increase parenting efficacy(17). A primary cause of these contradictions is the absence of a study which compares users and non-users."

- ***Time and place of the study should be mentioned in "method". (Both in the abstract and article body).***

Necessary changes have been made and these two sections are now rewritten as follows:

In abstract:

"In a cross-sectional study using stratified, two stages, cluster sampling, the data were collected from 3600 adolescents between 12-19 years in Isfahan, Iran. Participants were surveyed in January–March 2017 and recruited from schools. Family social capital was assessed using a questionnaire with adequate validity and reliability."

In manuscript body:

"The data was gathered from 3600 adolescents between the ages of 12-19 in a cross-sectional study in Isfahan, Iran. Participants were recruited from schools throughout Isfahan, using both stratified and random cluster sampling, in January–March 2017. The sample was first stratified by socioeconomic class, and then was stratified by gender. The socioeconomic classification reference was a study classifying the population of Isfahan to the three classes of well-supplied, moderately supplied, and under-supplied(18). A total number of 3655 adolescents were invited to participate in the study. Of them, 3600 adolescents participated. Participants completed a pencil and paper questionnaire and were informed about the participation and completion being completely voluntary. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee and Research Deputy of Isfahan University of Medical Sciences."

- ***Sample size calculation has not been explained.***

The following sentences have been included:

"The data was gathered from 3600 adolescents between the ages of 12-19 in a cross-sectional study in Isfahan, Iran. Participants were recruited from schools throughout Isfahan, using both stratified and random cluster sampling, in January–March 2017. The sample was first stratified by socioeconomic class, and then was stratified by gender. The socioeconomic classification reference was a study classifying the population of Isfahan to the three classes of well-supplied, moderately supplied, and under-supplied(18). A total number of 3655 adolescents were invited to participate in the study. Of them, 3600 adolescents participated. Participants completed a pencil and paper questionnaire and were informed about the participation and completion being completely voluntary. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee and Research Deputy of Isfahan University of Medical Sciences."

It is worth noting that, since the researchers had to build a valid and reliable scale for measuring family social capital; the sample size was determined in accordance with the existing instructions regarding the sample size required in structural equation modeling studies.

- ***I think it is needed to explain about the questionnaires in more details.***

The reviewer is right in that we did not include many details regarding the development and psychometrics of the family social capital scale. The word count limit law does not allow us to add

more sentences in this section. But in order to keep you informed about the details of this scale, more information is provided to you as follows:

It is worth noting that, the last two sentences, which relate to the reliability of the scale, have been added to the manuscript.

"Due to the absence of a reliable, standard scale for family social capital, in the first phase of the study the authors constructed a reliable, valid scale for measuring this concept. Extensive literature review and expert interviews were performed in order to implementation of the concept and Extracting items. At the next step, a panel of experts was established, and their views were used for qualitative and quantitative evaluation of the items by the means of two separate report forms for content validity index (CVI) and content validity ratio (CVR). For the CVI index, 0.79 was selected as the acceptable benchmark. For the CVR, 0.52 was determined as the acceptable benchmark. For determining the face validity and the understandability of the items, the scale was submitted to 30 members of the target group. They were asked to state their opinion about the understandability of each item using a Likert scale consisting of the “completely understandable”, ”understandable”, ”relatively understandable” and ”non-understandable” options. Also, they were asked via a discrete question to state their general opinions regarding the questionnaire and each item. After collecting their views, the impact score or the understandability of each item was determined. At this stage, no item was eliminated and only items with spelling mistakes were corrected.

The following subscales were obtained via exploratory factory analysis (EFA): family cohesion, family interactions, lack of family conflicts, and family control. Construct validity was measured via confirmatory factor analysis (CFA).The fit indices were satisfactory (CMIN/DF=3.414, RMSEA=0.042, GFA=0.939, AGFA=0.924, and all comparative indicators were above 0.9). The results of intergroup analysis and correlation analysis supported the validity of the developed scale. Reliability of the scale was confirmed using internal consistency in a pilot study consisted of 65 participants who were not the members of the target group. (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.69–0.94)"

- ***Discussion has been written weakly. Regarding the study main objective Interpretation of the results has not been described sufficiently. Compatibility or contradiction of research findings with previous studies should be interpreted more exactly.***

The discussion section focusing on the main variables of the study has been changed and re-written as follows:

"The results indicated that more than 76 percent of the adolescents participating in the study were users of social media. This is above the overall percentage of cell phone ownership in Asian adolescents, which is 62 percent(19).

It has been shown that there are gender-based differences in usage amount, usage type, usage reasons, and the type and amount of vulnerability in the adolescents' use of social media(20-22). Contrary to some studies reporting that females are more active in social media(22), the findings of this study indicated that males had a higher membership rate in social media, which is in line with the findings of Xin et al. (2017), that indicated the higher internet use among males than females(20). According to the results of this study, the mean scores for family conflicts and family monitoring were higher in female users. In line with the results of this study, a study by Ahmadi (2015) also showed meaningful gender-based difference in family monitoring over males and females, as females are under stronger family monitoring, and parents show more sensitivity and concerns in maintaining rule over female children(23).

While Saeed Khan et al. (2016) indicated that motives for using internet are to some extent determined by the socioeconomic status of users, and their position in social structure(24), this study showed no difference in the frequency of adolescent users among the three socioeconomic classes. This can be attributed to accessibility, ease of use, and relatively low costs of these media. After further investigation on users according to their socioeconomic status, the results indicated higher family cohesion and family monitoring in the higher socioeconomic classes. These findings indicate the significance of family's socioeconomic status regarding the manifestation of some aspects of family social capital. In line with the results of this study, Zhang (2012) and Banovcinova et al. (2014) have reported the higher family cohesion in families of higher socioeconomic levels (25, 26).

Although some studies suggest that using social media increases the effectiveness of communication between the family members and facilitates family monitoring (16, 17, 27), Results of this study indicated higher values for overall family social capital and all dimensions of family social capital in non-user adolescents. In other words, adolescents who did not use these media reported higher family interactions, family cohesion, and family monitoring, and less family conflicts.

These results are in line with the findings of Nie and Hillygus (2002) who reported that internet use at home has strong negative effects on the time spent with family members(13). Lee's study (2009) also showed a negative relationship between the time dedicated to online relationships, and the time dedicated to parents(11). An online survey by Vitak et al. (2011) indicated that due to the shift of social media from enhancing close ties towards forming relationships with strangers and establishing various groups; people currently use social media primarily for establishing weak ties, which means a low bonding social capital for the users of social media(28). Studies conducted by Wang et al. (2011), Yan et al. (2014), and Snyder et al. (2015), were also reported a negative relationship between the use of social media and the components of family social capital(14, 29, 30).

Chen et al. (2016) argue that these inconsistent findings are due to the exclusion of the usage type, stating that users must be divided into the two active and passive groups(31). Therefore, in addition to dividing the participants into two groups of users and non-users; investigating the usage patterns of the users is also necessary."

- ***Limitations of the study have not been described.***

The limitations section has been added to the manuscript as follows:

*"5.2. Limitations*

This study only investigated whether the adolescents were users or non-users of social media. Since the use of social media includes systematic patterns in which a specific medium can be used for different purposes, while also different media can be used for identical purposes, we recommend that future studies take this matter into account."

- ***Declaration of interest has not been included in the paper.***

This section has been added to the manuscript as follows:

**Declaration of Interest:** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

- ***References need some editions; book references should be corrected. Journal name abbreviations should be mentioned in the journal references. Please mention PMID and DOI of the articles in the references part.***

All references were re-checked and corrected

## 2 Revision 1

0 comments

*No public comments in this round.*

3

# Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

**Response to comments from Reviewer 1:**

We would like to thank the reviewer for careful and thorough reading of this manuscript and for the thoughtful comments and constructive suggestions, which help to improve the quality of this manuscript. We hope that the reviewer will find our responses to her/his comments satisfactory.

Please, find below the reviewer's comments in ***italics***, the authors' responses in purple, the corrected Sentences as well as the sentences added to the manuscript in red.

- ***Name of questionnaire and statistical tests used in the study should be mentioned in the abstract. If the questionnaire is researcher made, please point to this matter in the abstract.***
- ***Statistical tests and p value should be mentioned in the abstract.***

Necessary changes have been made and this section is now rewritten as follows:

**Methods:** In a cross-sectional study using stratified, two stages, cluster sampling, the data were collected from 3600 adolescents between 12-19 years in Isfahan, Iran. Participants were surveyed in January–March 2017 and recruited from schools. Family social capital was assessed using a researcher-made questionnaire with adequate validity and reliability. The independent, two-sample t-test, the Kruskal-Wallis test, the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and the Games-Howell post hoc test were used to analyze the data.

**Results:** More than 76 percent of the adolescents were social media users. Males reported higher membership rates compared to females. There was a meaningful difference between the mean scores in all dimensions of family social capital including family interactions, family cohesion, family monitoring, and family conflicts (P-value < 0.001); and the Non-user group scored better in these dimensions. There were gender-based differences between some dimensions of family social capital (P-value < 0.05). There were no statistically meaningful differences between the frequencies of users in the three socioeconomic classes of the study (P-value >0.05). Some dimensions of family social capital including family cohesion and family monitoring were better in users from higher socioeconomic classes (P-value < 0.05).

- **Type of the study should be mentioned in the method.**

The type of the study has been added as follows:

The data was gathered from 3600 adolescents between the ages of 12-19 in a descriptive-analytical cross-sectional study in Isfahan, Iran. Participants were recruited from schools*.....*

- ***Sample size calculation is not clear.***

Necessary changes have been made and this section is now rewritten as follows:

The data was gathered from 3600 adolescents between the ages of 12-19 in a descriptive-analytical cross-sectional study in Isfahan, Iran. Participants were recruited from schools throughout Isfahan, using both stratified and random cluster sampling, in January–March 2017. The sample was first stratified by socioeconomic class, and then was stratified by gender. The socioeconomic classification reference was a study classifying the population of Isfahan to the three classes of well-supplied, moderately supplied, and under-supplied(18). As the present study reports the findings of the second phase of a more comprehensive study which the first phase was devoted to developing scales and assessing structural relationships among the study's variables, the sample size was determined in accordance with the existing instructions regarding the sample size required in structural equation modeling studies(19). Participants completed a pencil and paper questionnaire and were informed about the participation and completion being completely voluntary. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee and Research Deputy of Isfahan University of Medical Sciences.

- ***In section 3.2 mentioned that "3540 of the total 3600 questionnaires were collected". While, in the previous section you said that " A total number of 3655 adolescents were invited to participate in the study. Of them, 3600 adolescents participated". I think these sentences needs revision.***

The reviewer is right and this section has been corrected as mentioned above

- ***Abbreviations used in the tables should be described.***

All of the tables moved to the end of the manuscript, every table in a separate page. All of the tables rechecked again and necessary changes including explanation of the Abbreviations have been made.

- ***The type of social media participants used was determined in the study. Please state the aim of this investigation.***

The reviewer is right and this section has been corrected follows:

To determine the user or non-user state of participating adolescents, they were asked, “Are you a social media user?". In this study, the term “social media” denotes virtual, cell phone or computer-based social networks popular among Iranian people.

- ***Limitations of the study should be mentioned before the conclusion.***

Necessary changes have been made.

## 3 Revision 2

2 comments · 17 Feb 2021 – 25 Feb 2021

### Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 17 Feb 2021

Dear author
Thank you for editing the manuscript. Of course, I think the sample size calculation has not been described sufficiently yet. Please clarify how you determined the sample size based on the structural equation model.
Please provide the reference for your study's first phase.
My decision: minor revision
Truly yours

### Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 25 Feb 2021

Thank you for your recent revisions.
Your paper has now been evaluated again. According to the reviewers' and associate editor's comments, it needs some more revisions. Please make your revisions according to these comments. I would appreciate it if you could make the revisions as soon as possible using the Track Changes mode in MS Word and colored text.

4

# Revision 3

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

**reply to reviewer:**

Thank you for your careful attention to this manuscript. I hope the corrections are appropriate and acceptable to your valuable comments.

- ***I think sample size calculation has not been described sufficiently yet. Please clarify how did you determined the sample size based on the structural equation model.***
- ***Please mention the reference of your study's first phase.***

1) Changes related to participants, sampling design and sample size **were fully performed**. This section is currently being rewritten as follows:

3.1. *Participants, sample size, and sampling method*

## Replace new sentences:

"The target population, in the analytical cross-sectional study, consisted of school students aged 12-19 years in Isfahan, Iran. The first part of the doctoral dissertation results was reported with the aim of Psychometric the measurement scales and the relationships between variables using structural equation modeling (SEM) (18). To assign samples to strata and clusters, a randomized multi-stage sampling design using probability proportional to size (PPS) was used. At first, Isfahan was divided into three privileged, semi-privileged and sub-regions according to SES variable (19). Then, six boys 'schools and six girls' schools as clusters from each strata were selected using simple random sampling.

To determine the minimum sample size in SEM, based on guidelines based on the ratio of cases to estimated parameters, a ratio of 20: 1 is desirable (20). The research hypothesis was that probably the most complex SEM model could have about 25 parameters. Therefore, 20 cases were considered for each parameter (n=500). According to two strata variables (3 × 2=6), and the independence of the strata in allocating the sample, the final estimate of the sample size was, with a probability of attrition of 20%, about 3600 students (500 × 6 + 600)."

## Previous sentences:

"The data was gathered from 3600 adolescents between the ages of 12-19 in a descriptive-analytical cross-sectional studycross-sectional study in Isfahan, Iran. Participants were recruited from schools throughout Isfahan, using both stratified and random cluster sampling, in January–March 2017. The sample was first stratified by socioeconomic class, and then was stratified by gender. The socioeconomic classification reference was a study classifying the population of Isfahan to the three classes of well-supplied, moderately supplied, and under-supplied(19). A total number of 4655 adolescents were invited to participate in the study. Of them, 3600 adolescents participated. As the present study reports the findings of the second phase of a more comprehensive study which the first phase was devoted to developing scales and assessing structural relationships among the study's variables, the sample size was determined in accordance with the existing instructions regarding the sample size required in structural equation modeling studies(21). Participants completed a pencil and paper questionnaire and were informed about the participation and completion being completely voluntary. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee and Research Deputy of Isfahan University of Medical Sciences."

2) The initial sentence about the data preprocessing section changed completely. This section was rewritten as follows:

3.2. *Data pre-processing*

***Replace new sentences:***

" In 2017, from January to March, 3,600 students were invited to participate in completing a self-report questionnaire. By removing immaterial data, missing data and indifferent people using visual analysis and STDEV.P method, 2800 questionnaires were entered into the analysis stage".

***Previous sentences:***

"3540 of the total 3600 questionnaires were collected. 2800 questionnaire remained after identifying and managing immaterial data, missing data, and indifferent persons using visual analysis and the STDEV.P methods."

## 4 Revision 3

2 comments · 22 Jun 2023 – 24 Jun 2023

### Associate Editor

ACCEPT 22 Jun 2023

Thank you very much for revising the manuscript. I think the necessary revisions have been made and the manuscript can be published in IJPBS.

### Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 24 Jun 2023

We have completed our review of your manuscript and are pleased to inform you that it is being considered for publication in the IJPBS. Note that the publication of your article will be finalized only with your cooperation in the editorial process.
Thank you for your fine contribution. On behalf of the Editors of IJPBS, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.