sustainability

'Digital Wellbeing' Special Issue Resubmission – Response to Reviewer Feedback

Dear Reviewer 4,

Firstly, many thanks for the time and dedication taken to provide this timely and thorough review of the paper. The excellent feedback provided has led to a series of major revisions throughout the manuscript which, the author believes, has significantly improved the quality and rigour of the paper.

The revised version of the paper has now been uploaded and the comments presented in the tables below describe the response made to each item of feedback:

Reviewer 4	**Author Response**
Dear authors, thank you for the opportunity to study the manuscript with the title „Managing the Right to Disconnect – A Scoping Review ". From my point of view, the article is interesting, it discusses current issues and contains a well-processed review of professional literature in the given field. I have the following comments:	Many thanks for the kind and encouraging words.
Abstract: I recommend to add the main aim of the manuscript.	Many thanks. The Abstract (p.1) has now been rewritten, to better describe the main aim of the manuscript, and now reads as follows: *In recent years, several countries have introduced 'right to disconnect' laws to protect workers' rest times, by giving them legal rights to disconnect from work-related communication outside normal working hours. This is a response to growing concerns for the digital wellbeing of workers, the state of hyperconnectivity created by today's digital technologies, and how it can result in*

	constant connectivity to work. The aim of this paper is to review the existing academic literature available on this topic, to identify key themes and potential research gaps relating to the right to disconnect and derive practical implications for managers needing to adopt this policy. Using the scoping review method and keywords 'right to disconnect,' n=9966 records were retrieved from the databases APA PsycNet, EBSCOhost, Emerald Insight, Gale, ProQuest Central, Scopus, and Web of Science, from which a final sample of n=21 journal articles from n=15 different countries were eligible for analysis. These articles were found to primarily span three academic disciplines; law, health, and business, and highlighted four key themes - work-life balance, scope, governance, and health & wellbeing – as being critical factors for the successful implementation of the right to dis-connect, as a sustainable digital wellbeing initiative for employees.
Within the Introduction chapter, it would be appropriate to add sub-goals of the SDGs that relate to the addressed issue.	Thanks again, another really good recommendation. The Introduction section (p.2) has now been expanded, to include a new section that discusses the sub-goals of the SDGs that relate to the addressed issue, which reads as follows: *RTD also has clear links to sustainability, and a number of the United Nations (UN) sustainable development goals (SDGs) - particularly SDG3 Good Health and Wellbeing [8, 9], SDG5 Gender Equality [6], and SDG8 Decent Work and Economic Growth [9]. More specifically, RTD supports Target 3.4's mission to promote mental health and wellbeing and reduce suicide mortality rates; Target's 5.5 goal to ensure women's full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership; and Target 8.8's aim to protect la-bour rights and promote safe and secure working environments for all workers, and reduce fatal and non-fatal occupational injuries. Overall, RTD has sparked discussions globally about the importance of setting boundaries between work and personal lives in the digital age [10, 11].*
Six different databases were used for the purpose of analysis. One of the largest databases is the Scopus database, and it is not entirely clear why this one was not used.	Many thanks for this suggestion. In previous scoping reviews we have used the six databases described, plus ScienceDirect, based on the collective feedback we've received from previous reviewers. However, based on your advice, a similar search has now been conducted using the Scopus database.

	A total of n=165 articles were found, of which n=3 new health articles were discovered, which did not appear in the final sample used in the previous version of the paper. The paper has now been amended, to acknowledge the use of Scopus as a 7th database source for this investigation, and to include the n=3 new articles. All results, tables and figures etc. have been amended to reflect this new information. Many thanks again for your recommendation, I think these n=3 new articles make a worthy addition to the paper (as they discuss additional issues like headaches, eye strain, and insomnia), but they don't impact the original themes.
I also recommend adding a short and concise description of the experts who selected relevant publications from the total sample. Alternatively, what were the criteria for evaluating the publication as relevant?	Thank you. The Materials and Methods section has been amended to better describe the experts who assisted in selecting the relevant publications for the final sample, and the criteria that was used for evaluating the publications as being relevant. The relevant parts of Section 2 (p.4) now read as follows: *To ensure a reasonable exploration of the topic was present in the article, the sample was then screened to confirm the exact term 'right to disconnect' appeared either in the title of the article, as a keyword, or in the Abstract section, in line with the screening process recommended by Pham et al. [29]. Upon completion of this Screening step, n=9934 records were excluded as not being relevant to this line investigation, and n=32 records were identified for eligibility assessment.* *The Eligibility step of PRISMA- ScR, involved checking and reading full texts of the remaining n=32 records, to ascertain eligibility for inclusion in the final sample. This step was completed individually, by the author and two other members of the research team, who then met as a group afterwards to collectively make a final decision. The other members of the research team are both retired professors, with extensive experience of this research method, and the context in which it is currently being employed.*
I thank the authors and wish them success in their scientific research.	Many thanks for your encouraging words!