




## Ranking Adolescent Stressors Linked to Urban Lifestyle and Overexposure

Emre. Yildiz<sup>1</sup>, Eszter. Kovács<sup>2\*</sup>, Samuel. Moreau<sup>3</sup>


<sup>1</sup> Department of General Psychology, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Türkiye

<sup>2</sup> Department of Psychology, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary



<sup>3</sup> Department of Family Counseling, McGill University, Montreal, Canada

\* Corresponding author email address: eszter.kovacs@elte.hu

### Editor

Muhammad Rizwan  
Associate Professor, Department of  
Psychology, Haripur University,  
Islamabad, Pakistan  
muhammad.rizwan@uoh.edu.pk

### Reviewers

**Reviewer 1:** Mohammad Hassan Ghanifar  
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Birjand Branch, Islamic Azad  
University, Birjand, Iran. Email: ghanifar@iaubir.ac.ir  
**Reviewer 2:** Abotaleb Saadati Shamir  
Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Sciences, University of Science and  
Research, Tehran, Iran. Email: psychology@iau.ac.ir

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The paragraph beginning “From a theoretical standpoint, the convergence of environmental and psychosocial perspectives offers a comprehensive lens...” effectively mentions ecological and social-cognitive models, but lacks explicit theoretical predictions or conceptual framework figure. The reviewer recommends adding a conceptual model showing hypothesized relations between domains (academic, digital, environmental).

The table listing “Extracted Themes, Subthemes, and Open Codes” is comprehensive, but several “Concepts” overlap semantically (e.g., “emotional exhaustion” appears in multiple themes). The reviewer recommends merging redundant codes and clarifying whether frequency counts or coding weights informed theme prioritization.

In Theme 2: Digital Overexposure and Screen Fatigue, the authors describe “attention fragmentation” and “reduced sleep quality.” It would strengthen credibility to include at least one verbatim quote or example from reviewed literature to illustrate these emergent concepts.

In Table 2, mean ranks are reported, but no standard deviations, confidence intervals, or test statistics are presented. Include  $\chi^2$  and p values from the Friedman test, and clarify how ties in ranking were handled.

The sentence “These findings suggest that cognitive and social pressures related to performance and technology use are stronger predictors of adolescent distress...” (Findings section) uses the word predictors, implying causality. Replace with “stronger correlates” or “more strongly associated stress domains,” as the cross-sectional design precludes causal inference.

“Figure 1 Ranking of Adolescent Stressors...” is mentioned but not visually explained. Ensure that the figure is included, properly labeled, and interpreted in text (e.g., highlighting ranking gradients or gender differences if any).

In Discussion, paragraph 2 (“The dominance of academic and performance pressure corroborates evidence from multiple contexts...”), expand the comparison beyond Asia (Korea, India) to include European parallels (e.g., Germany, Poland) to justify the Hungarian context.

The paragraph referencing Malik et al. (2023) usefully introduces gendered stressors. However, the argument would be stronger if supported by local gender-specific findings from your dataset (e.g., mean rank differences between males and females).

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

### 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In Methods and Materials: Study Design and Participants, the authors state, “The quantitative phase included 200 adolescent participants from urban regions of Hungary...” without describing city names, socioeconomic distribution, or response rate. Please provide these details and ethical recruitment procedures to strengthen transparency and reproducibility.

In Measures, the manuscript notes that the structured questionnaire was “developed based on themes identified in the qualitative synthesis,” but it is unclear whether content validity was reviewed by experts or pilot-tested. The reviewer suggests describing item generation, pilot feedback, and any factor-analytic evidence.

The Discussion treats each domain sequentially, yet the conclusion implies interaction (“digital saturation amplifies academic stress”). The reviewer recommends presenting a subsection analyzing potential inter-domain synergies or a path model discussion.

Some in-text citations (e.g., “Zehra Habib Sukaina Shaukat, 2023”) lack standard APA author–year formatting. Ensure uniform reference style and verify that all references appear in the reference list with correct DOIs.

The paragraph beginning “Furthermore, the findings resonate with ecological models emphasizing that adolescent well-being is shaped by nested systems...” is strong conceptually but would benefit from specifying which Bronfenbrenner system (microsystem, mesosystem, etc.) corresponds to each stressor.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.