Reviewer 2

( ) Extensive editing of English language and style required
( ) Moderate English changes required
( ) English language and style are fine/minor spell check required
( ) I don't feel qualified to judge about the English language and style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Can be improved</th>
<th>Must be improved</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the introduction provide sufficient background and include all relevant references?</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the research design appropriate?</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the methods adequately described?</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the results clearly presented?</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the conclusions supported by the results?</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An extremely interesting and well researched paper. Very good, if short, conclusion. Very clear description of methods and results.

Excellent and accurate set of references, some of which I need to track down and read such as Nadin’s book. Only one typo I spotted in item 21 where “versiono f” should be “version of”.

Dear colleague,

Thank you very very much for your kind and positive appreciation of our article! Please find below our answers to your review:


2. Thank you very much for all the language corrections.

This is a fertile research field which will reward further work. While this is primarily about smartphone usage (as pointed out at lines 228-229, I wonder whether interneticus-style behaviours differ across the less portable platforms such as tablets and PCs – for example for those using multiple platforms, do the behaviours vary?

3. There is surely a slight difference between the old-style users who prefer a big PC with a clear delimited space from where they access the Internet and ideally using two big monitors (as I do) and the “born digital” younger users who prefer to do almost everything (including homework and watching movies) on a mobile phone. We used a factual question to collect data on the most preferred device for
accessing the Internet, but since the sample population was quite young their answers showed a preference for using a mobile phone (smartphone 74% compared with desktop 5%). We therefore did not perform an analysis for this variable, but we intend to repeat the study using an updated version of the questionnaire and will then be able to see if it is possible to compare types of user by preferred device.

Another topic which I would find interesting relates to the type of content being accessed – there is a little in there, but it would be interesting for further research to understand the languages of the material being accessed and whether this varies across the sample (in the Romanian case, is it mostly Romanian, French, English, German, Italian or Russian, for example?). I am interested in this from the perspective of colonisation by language in relation to cultural change and outcomes – and the mode of accessing technology affects this process.

4. In our approach we collected only the type of applications (logged by smartphone) and not the content. Indeed, it would be very interesting to analyze browser history (there are already some text-to-data based research studies for the UK made using large samples of browser histories and Twitter activity logs). At this stage we have limited our study to considering the type of Internet use.

Line 44: earlier models are always cheaper simply because they are regarded as "old" technology and harder to sell, and certainly the point is valid. However, new models of smartphones are always much more expensive than the initial price of the previous model. While this paper is about usage and addictive behaviours, I just wonder whether the lust for the latest expensive model is in itself a symptom of addiction. There was not a question on this in this survey, but might be a thought for any repeat of the survey – repeating the survey may also identify any changes over time.

5. Indeed, the attractiveness of new, fashionable gadgets could be used as a component variable in an addiction scale. We are working on the design of the next level of this research and this dimension is a good candidate for inclusion; thank you very much for the suggestion!

Table 3 is very interesting. Was any analysis done of non-response. It appears that for some questions non-response was quite high and may have introduced biases. [Just a side note: "non-response" is more usual than non-answers]

6. Yes, it was difficult for the subjects to estimate how long they actually spent on the Internet, or how long they would be able to cope without it. We didn’t mark this item as compulsory (because others were more important). It was precisely due to the bias introduced by the high level of non-response that we did not carry out in depth analysis of this aspect. The “non-response” point has been corrected.
Appendix A: Translation is a bit stilted in places although the meaning is clear. Also some errors in the labels in the tables.

Important points:

(1) "below" is repeatedly typed as "bellow" [fig 1 and tables 4&5].

(2) "productivity" in fig 2 is missing a "t".

(3) preamble at line 258 would be better English as "By completing this questionnaire you accept the use of your answers in an aggregate statistical way".

(4) line 260 Q1 "From what age did you constantly access the internet".

(5) question 6 would be better as "I think about my smartphone when not using it" or if you have an intensive in the original "... even when not using it" and

(6) question 10 in the appendix should be "People around me tell me I use my smartphone too much"

Thank you very much for all of this; we will make all the corrections in the text.