

Exploring Lifestyle Pressures and Expectations Induced by Continuous Health Monitoring




Orsolya. Demetrovics^{1*}, Rafael. Ballester-Ripoll², Joel. Billieux³

¹ Institute of Psychology, ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary

² Department of Personality, Assessment, and Psychological Treatments, University of Valencia, Spain

³ Institute for Behavioural Addictions, Sigmund Freud University Vienna, Austria

* Corresponding author email address: orso.demetrovics@ehok.elte.hu

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Valerie Karstensen  Department of Regional Health Research, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark valekarstensen@health.sdu.dk	Reviewer 1: Richard Jurin  Department of Psychology, Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia. Email: richard.jurin@unizg.hr Reviewer 2: Diana Rodrigues da Silva  Insight - Piaget Research Center for Human and Ecological Development, Escola Higher de Education Jean Piaget, Almada, Portugal. Email: DianadaSilva@ese.ipv.pt

1. Round 1

1.1 Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

This paragraph could benefit from a clearer delineation between clinical efficacy and user experience. Consider restructuring to first summarize benefits, then introduce psychosocial concerns.

This is an important conceptual point. Strengthen this sentence by briefly explaining how subjective interpretation of data affects psychological outcomes—possibly with a cited example or sub-group (e.g., adolescents).

Provide a more nuanced analysis of gamification. Are there differences in its impact by age or gender? Citing empirical evidence here would enhance credibility.

Clarify whether the design follows phenomenology, grounded theory, or another qualitative tradition. This helps situate the analytical framework.

Consider elaborating on gendered responses to algorithmic judgment. Did male and female participants differ in emotional reactivity or self-worth evaluation?

This phenomenon aligns with obsessive-compulsive behavior. You may want to reference literature from health psychology or behavioral addiction for deeper insight.

You could enrich this analysis by briefly connecting it to surveillance capitalism or social capital theory, especially when discussing peer visibility through shared platforms.

Important point. Strengthen this by clarifying which specific ideals were referenced (e.g., thinness, calorie counting) and how they conflicted with local norms.

Consider emphasizing intersectionality—how digital health burden is amplified among users facing both economic and technological marginalization.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

1.2 Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Consider adding a brief comparison of generational attitudes toward digital monitoring—e.g., digital natives vs. older adults—to contextualize varying user responses.

This is a pivotal transition. Strengthen it by briefly introducing the psychosocial lens of your study (e.g., surveillance theory, Foucault's panopticism) to ground your contribution conceptually.

Provide more detail on inclusion/exclusion criteria. For instance, how was "active use" of monitoring tools operationalized? Were participants screened for psychological vulnerability?

Consider including 1–2 specific examples of the actual interview questions used, perhaps as an appendix, for transparency and replication purposes.

Specify the pre-existing frameworks (if any) that informed the deductive coding. Were any psychological or behavioral theories (e.g., Self-Determination Theory) used?

The table is rich in data but consider indicating how frequently these experiences were mentioned across participants to help readers assess prevalence.

This code is compelling. You might consider further distinguishing between anticipatory anxiety (before metrics are known) and reactive mood swings (after seeing results).

This theme is highly relevant. However, it could be analytically strengthened by exploring whether platform design features (e.g., public sharing) explicitly shape these experiences.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.