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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to re-review this manuscript. The authors do not appear to have addressed my major compulsory revisions 5-11.

Moreover, major compulsory revision 4 and 12 have been mistakenly cut and pasted together into one:

"Major compulsory revisions4. Background. I did not get a good sense of why sleepiness is an important measured a range of variables on mobile phone use (total daily volume, perceptions etc), did you have a hypothesis about anything else other than mobile phone use at night"

If the authors have addressed these revisions as a response to the previous reviewers, could they please still make it clear where this has occurred (e.g., something along the lines of see reviewer 2, revision 8)? This would assist me in the re-review. Thank you.
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