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| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | **This study is significant as it addresses a prevalent health issue among adolescents—neck pain associated with excessive smartphone use and craniovertebral posture. The study provides valuable insights into how modern lifestyle habits influence musculoskeletal health, particularly in the adolescent population. The findings contribute to the existing literature by emphasizing modifiable risk factors such as screen time and posture, which can be targeted for preventive interventions. Given the increasing use of digital devices among youth, the study has both clinical and public health implications.** | Thank you for your thoughtful feedback. We appreciate your recognition of the study’s significance. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title is clear and relevant. However, a slight modification for clarity and impact could be: "Smartphone Usage and Craniovertebral Angle: Key Predictors of Neck Pain in Adolescents—A Cross-Sectional Study"**  **This revised title maintains the original intent while improving clarity.** | Thank you for your suggestion. We have revised the title to enhance clarity and impact as recommended. |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | **The abstract is well-structured and provides a clear summary of the study's background, methodology, results, and conclusion. However, the following improvements are suggested:**  **Clarify the significance of the study by briefly mentioning how the results can inform preventive strategies.**  **Specify the statistical methods used in more detail, particularly in the results section.**  **Define the R² value (variance explained) more explicitly to enhance the interpretation of findings.** | Thank you for your valuable feedback. We have revised the abstract to clarify the study’s significance, specifying that identifying predictors of neck pain informs preventive strategies. We also provided more details on the statistical methods, including binomial logistic regression with odds ratios and confidence intervals, and explicitly defined Nagelkerke’s R² as the proportion of variance explained. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | The manuscript is scientifically sound, with robust methodology and appropriate statistical analysis. The use of logistic regression to determine predictors strengthens the reliability of the findings. However:  The discussion could better elaborate on causal relationships or acknowledge that a cross-sectional design limits causality inference.  The study’s strengths (e.g., objective smartphone usage data) and limitations (e.g., self-reported pain levels) should be more explicitly stated. | Thank you for your valuable feedback. We have revised the discussion to acknowledge the limitations of our cross-sectional design in establishing causality and have explicitly stated the strengths (objective smartphone usage data) and limitations (self-reported pain levels) of our study. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | The references are recent and relevant, covering various aspects of neck pain, smartphone use, and postural assessment. However, the following references may add value:  -Ergonomic interventions for smartphone users (e.g., studies discussing posture correction strategies).  - Longitudinal studies on neck pain progression in adolescents. | Thank you for your suggestion. We have incorporated additional references on ergonomic interventions for smartphone users and longitudinal studies on neck pain progression in adolescents, further enhancing the depth of the introduction and discussion. |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but minor grammatical and syntactical improvements are needed in some areas:  - Simplify long and complex sentences.  - Ensure consistency in verb tenses, particularly when describing results. | The necessary grammatical improvements were made. |
| Optional/General comments | **· Consider including figures or diagrams illustrating craniovertebral angle measurement for better clarity.**  **· It may be beneficial to expand on the implications of tablet use, as it showed an inverse association with neck pain.**  **The manuscript is well-structured and scientifically valid but requires minor revisions for clarity, language refinement, and slight elaboration in the discussion.**  **The study provides valuable insights into the relationship between smartphone usage, craniovertebral angle, and neck pain in adolescents. With minor revisions, it will be a strong contribution to the field of musculoskeletal research.** | Thank you for your suggestion. The demonstrative image of the craniovertebral angle assessment has been added to the Methods section.  We have expanded the discussion on the implications of tablet use, as recommended.  We appreciate your valuable feedback. All suggested revisions have been implemented, enhancing clarity, refining the language, and further elaborating on the discussion as advised. |
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|  | **Reviewer’s comment** | **Author’s comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* | The study adhered to the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidelines and complied with the ethical principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki and Resolution 466/12 of the National Commission for Research Ethics (CONEP) of the Brazilian Ministry of Health. Ethical approval was obtained from the Research Ethics Committee of the Health Sciences Center at the Universidade Federal de Pernambuco (UFPE) (CAAE: 70089917.5.0000.52088). |