


# Impact of a Digital Detox Program on Screen Time and Sleep Hygiene in Adolescents




Yinghao. Pan<sup>1</sup>, Wei. Zhang<sup>2\*</sup>, Amirul Iskandar<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> VNU University of Education, 144 Xuan Thuy, Cau Giay, Hanoi, Vietnam

<sup>2</sup> Department of Psychology, Peking University, Beijing, China

<sup>3</sup> Department of Educational and Counselling Psychology, University of Dhaka, Dhaka-1000, Bangladesh

\* Corresponding author email address: weizhang99@pku.edu.cn

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Trevor Archer  Professor Department of Psychology University of Gothenburg, Sweden trevorcsarcher49@gmail.com	<b>Reviewer 1:</b> Sara Nejatifar  Department of Psychology and Education of People with Special Needs, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran. Email: s.nejatifar@edu.ui.ac.ir <b>Reviewer 2:</b> Kamdin. Parsakia  Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinarsakia@kmanresce.ca

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the same paragraph, consider integrating a more critical perspective on the dual nature of screen time (educational vs. recreational), as the current framing may unintentionally conflate all forms of usage with negative outcomes.

The statement “sleep deficits during these formative years can thus negatively affect academic performance...” could be clarified by distinguishing between short-term and chronic sleep deprivation, which may have differing effects.

In the final paragraph of the Introduction, the claim that “empirical research on digital detox interventions specifically targeting adolescents... remains relatively sparse” could be supported with a systematic review citation to avoid appearing anecdotal.

The last paragraph of the Introduction appropriately identifies methodological gaps, but the sentence “objective metrics of screen time and sleep parameters... can bolster the reliability” should also acknowledge the ethical and technical barriers to their use with minors.

In Session 4 (“Managing Screen Triggers and Urges”), the description mentions “coping statements,” yet no examples are given. Providing 1–2 examples would enhance clarity and replicability of the intervention.

In the “Data Analysis” paragraph, the statement “The analysis focused on interaction effects...” should include rationale for using Bonferroni correction, considering the risk of Type II error in small samples.

The phrase in the Discussion, “Participants... reported better bedtime routines, less delayed sleep onset...” would benefit from being supported by more granular data, such as changes in sleep onset latency or bedtime consistency, if available.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the second paragraph of the Introduction, the phrase “the requirement of digital devices for school-related tasks” would benefit from citation of recent data quantifying the proportion of educational screen use during and after the COVID-19 pandemic.

The sentence in the third paragraph stating that “sleep disturbance ranks as one of the most urgent concerns” would be strengthened by referencing specific prevalence rates of sleep problems in Chinese adolescents to contextualize urgency locally.

In the Methods section under “Study Design and Participants,” the exclusion of participants with “diagnosed sleep disorders” is noted, yet it would be prudent to clarify whether subclinical sleep disturbances (which are common in adolescents) were included or not.

The “Screen Time” subsection describes the STQ instrument but lacks specific information on whether the Chinese version of this tool has been validated in adolescent populations—this should be stated explicitly or justified.

In the “Sleep Hygiene” subsection, the authors describe the ASHS as having “six subscales,” but do not report subscale-level findings. It is recommended to clarify why only total scores were analyzed, given the potential for subscale differentiation (e.g., cognitive vs. physiological factors).

The demographic paragraph in the Results section mentions gender and age distribution, but lacks information on socioeconomic status, which may be a confounding factor influencing screen access and sleep hygiene—this omission should be acknowledged or discussed.

The authors state in Table 2 that  $\eta^2 = .67$  for the time  $\times$  group interaction on screen time. This is a large effect size and merits further commentary in the Discussion regarding the practical significance and possible ceiling effects of the intervention.

In the Discussion, the sentence “These data coincide with earlier indications that interventions that combine behavioral guidelines... can significantly curtail problematic technology consumption” could be deepened by specifying which components of the intervention were most likely driving these changes.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.