Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript is a comprehensive and detailed review so that readers can clearly understand the research progress in various aspects of Internet addiction.   But there are the following problems: 1. The topic is not clear.   The title is "Neurobiological Risk Factors for Problematic Social Media Use: Vital Hypotheses and Upcoming Perspectives, but a large number of findings reviewed in this paper are related to Internet addiction, not problematic social media use (PSMU).   Please pay attention to the emphasis of the article. The title should be changed to make it more relevant, or the content not related to PSMU should be cut.   2. Abstract and keywords are not strong enough to summarize the article.   3. There are some spelling and grammar errors, such as "ethnogeographic" and "a adolescent".   4. The Social Media Disorder Scale (SDMS) and Bergen Social Media Addiction Scale were mentioned in the manuscript, but their specific reliability and validity values were not reported.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 82098

Title: Neurobiological risk factors for problematic social media use as a specific form of internet addiction: a narrative review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06455672

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MHSc

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Portugal

Author's Country/Territory: Russia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-24 12:00

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-30 19:18

Review time: 6 Days and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent　[ ] Grade B: Very good　[ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair　[ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent　[ ] Grade B: Good　[ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent　[ ] Grade B: Good　[ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent　　[ ] Grade B: Good　　[Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing　[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing　[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing　[ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority)　[ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision　[Y] Major revision　[ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes　[ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous　[ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes　[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1-Title:　It does not mention that it is a review.　Suggestion: It should be added to the title that it is a literature review and the type of review 2-Abstract:　The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript　3-Key Words　The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript 4-　Background: The manuscript adequately describes the background, current status, and significance of the study but does not describe but does describe the objectives of the review or the type of literature review it intends to conduct. 5 Methods: The manuscript does not describe the type of review it performed or the type of protocol it followed for that purpose. It does not present search criteria or article selection criteria. Without the review objectives and the research protocol, it is difficult to evaluate the review presented. 6-Results: The objectives and research protocol of this review were not specified, so the scope of this literature review is unclear　7:Discussion: There is no specific chapter for discussion. Although does the manuscript adequately and appropriately interpret the results, highlighting the key points in a concise, clear, and logical manner of the findings in the review? Scientific significance and/or relevance of the topic to clinical practice is presented. 11 References:

The manuscript properly cites the most recent references. The vast majority are less than five years old, although a small number are more than ten years old. 12-Quality of manuscript organization and presentation: The manuscript is well, organized and presented in a concise and coherent manner, although it does not meet the Guidelines for manuscript preparation, submission and format: Revision as stated in the journal 13 Research methods and reporting: The Authors do not prepare their manuscript according to the standards for the type of manuscript and the appropriate category, according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. 14 14 Ethics statements: This manuscript is a review Suggestions to the authors: In the introduction they should clarify what kind of review they intend to carry out, what their objectives are, and present the research protocol (to understand if it meets the criteria and how and where the research was done) They should follow the journal's guidelines for submission of a review manuscript.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The changes are as suggested and the manuscript is quite suitable for publication in the journal.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 82098

Title: Neurobiological risk factors for problematic social media use as a specific form of internet addiction: a narrative review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06153778

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Russia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-27

Reviewer chosen by: Li Li

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-14 08:01

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-14 15:37

Review time: 7 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent　[Y] Grade B: Very good　[ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair　[ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing　[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing　[ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority)　[Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision　[ ] Major revision　[ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous　[ ] Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

After modification, the structure and content of this paper have been improved, with comprehensive exposition and clear research objectives. But there are too many keywords. It is recommended to reduce to 3-5 keywords.