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Reviewer's report:

The revised manuscript is much improved. For example, the background is updated, the methods are better described, and limitations are stated. However, there are still some points that need to be addressed.

Major compulsory revisions:

1. The conclusion in the abstract is still too confident – an easy solution is to change from “is” to “was” (i.e. a conclusion relating to the study and not a generalized truth). Also, make sure the main conclusion corresponds in the abstract and manuscript.

2. The aim is still not stated in the main manuscript.

3. The last sentence of the Results (“Thus, the association…”) belongs in the Discussion. I think too much emphasis is put on the variables that were not included in the final model. The post-hoc analyses are very interesting, but it is not obvious that these variables are moderators of the relationship between the variables that remained in the model and increased ESS scores. They can be covariates or mediators - so, I think it is necessary to tone done the “were both likely moderators…” . Perhaps, they can be discussed more in terms of what characterized the high access group and/or as possible mediators or mechanisms?

4. There is something strange about Table 3. Accessibility was recoded from five to four categories (was it “all day” and “around the clock” that became “all day”? - should be explained). But what was used as reference? All 4 categories are presented as results. The analysis and the table need to be explained better. Also, the asterisks in the heading probably belong to Table 2?

Minor essential revisions

1. I miss a mentioning of how the respondents were contacted. Was the survey monkey sent via student email addresses?

2. The item “having tried but failed to reduce mobile phone use” is mentioned in various ways throughout the manuscript. The last sentence in the 1st paragraph of Results may be better turned around (i.e. 17% had tried but failed to reduce their mobile phone use) - a simple way to get the “but failed” in. And in the last paragraph of Results it says “attempted to quit”. Please check the manuscript for these variations.

3. An association between texting and ESS is discarded in Results, therefore the
sentence about “If the sheer number of text messages … likely with a small effect size” seems superfluous in the Discussion.

4. Table 2: The asterisks need to be explained.

Discretionary revision

1. I find the comment about adolescent females scoring higher on the ESS without being objectively sleepier odd in the context.
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