

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Psychiatry*

**Manuscript NO:** 84136

**Title:** Relationship between depression, smartphone addiction, and sleep among Chinese engineering students during the COVID-19 pandemic

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05946096

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Lecturer

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Turkey

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-02-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-02-27 18:46

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-02 20:44

**Review time:** 3 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It has been a very good work for the literature. Congratulations. I have stated a few small correction suggestions in the file. Sincerely.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Psychiatry*

**Manuscript NO:** 84136

**Title:** Relationship between depression, smartphone addiction, and sleep among Chinese engineering students during the COVID-19 pandemic

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06208740

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Full Professor, Nurse

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Portugal

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-02-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-03-06 22:03

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-15 13:03

**Review time:** 8 Days and 14 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I appreciate the opportunity to review this manuscript and hope my comments assist in the revision process. The material is interesting and the topic is timely and relevant. The method seems to have been followed faithfully and the authors were well-positioned to conduct the analysis. Despite these positives, in my view, the paper needs more work before it could be published and I have made some specific suggestions below.

- Indicate the study's design in the title, abstract and method section.
- Whereas all the information provided in the abstract is important, there is a lot of information presented that could be condensed to give a briefer overview of the paper.

**Introduction** - The paper does not cite an appropriate range of literature sources. Overall organization and clarity throughout the manuscript should be improved. For the introduction, a restructuring of the writing to provide more coherent and connected ideas and sections would be valuable. Brief synopsis or synthesis of ideas and relationships between or within constructs would improve flow dramatically. What is the study's biggest contribution? The contribution should be clearly stated in the introduction. The reader would like to know why the study conducted in such a study sample is so crucial.

**Method** - Was this



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

study part of a larger study with more variables? Has any of this data been published? - Is it necessary to clarify the method employed? - In your methods section, say that you used the STROBE cross-sectional reporting guidelines. - Survey distribution methods [website - link, email invite,...]? - Provide a clear description of the selection criteria of participants. Were the sample sizes sufficiently powered to detect effects? How did the researchers decide on the sample size? - Some subjects refused to participate. Response rate? - The ethical aspects in collecting data are not specifically clarified, independently of the voluntary nature of the subject's participation, variables such as the approval by the local IRB, sharing and use of data and informed consent are not patent. - There is little explanation as to why you analyze your data in the way that you do, or why your methods are appropriate (statistical procedures). - The process of analysis should be made as transparent as possible. What strategies were used to avoid duplications or fraud in the online survey? Did you analyze any potential non-response bias? And early vs late bias? Did you check if data can suffer from common method bias? Results - A better visual structure of tables (boldface variables with statistical significance) would improve the readability. - How did the authors handle missing data? Discussion - Some of the contributions that are highlighted here could be flagged in the introduction for a more consistent narrative throughout the paper. I believe there should be better integration of the results with the existing literature. - A stronger discussion of implications for future research and potential intervention work is needed. While there is a brief section on implications, there is much to be discussed for policymakers regarding future research. I believe this will considerably strengthen this interesting paper. - Theoretical and methodological limitations should be emphasized more deeply.

**CHECKLIST FOR STYLE** The manuscript will serve a broad audience of students, researchers, and practitioners, however, the manuscript needs to be carefully and attentively proofread, because some sentences are awkwardly constructed, punctuation



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

is deficient, and therefore reading is occasionally difficult to follow. That leads me to believe that it needs careful editing by a native English speaker.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Psychiatry*

**Manuscript NO:** 84136

**Title:** Relationship between depression, smartphone addiction, and sleep among Chinese engineering students during the COVID-19 pandemic

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06208740

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Full Professor, Nurse

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Portugal

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-02-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** Yu-Lu Chen

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-04-10 23:23

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-04-11 21:22

**Review time:** 21 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

statements

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

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

I believe that the review carried out has greatly improved the quality of the study. Also, I do think that the author(s) addresses the broad questions, appropriately which were asked.