

Rebuttal comments: The Impact of Mobile Device Utilization on Mealtime Distractions and Metabolic Health

Reviewer 1	
Comments	Response
This study examines how using technology during meals affects several facets of metabolic health. The authors examined qualitative data which focused on the relationships between smartphone and tablet use during meals and metabolic health outcomes. Variables such as postprandial metabolic responses, food composition, and calorie consumption were included. Although the definition of smartphone and tablet use is difficult and hard to be qualified, most of the data that the authors provided were from experimental studies.	The current study is a narrative review. Moreover, I have updated the title for clarification “Exploring the Impact of Mobile Device Use on Mealtime Distractions and Its Consequences for Metabolic Health: A Narrative Review”
They can give more study power to reveal the complex relationship between mealtime distractions and technology use at the table.	Table 1 has included as per request
The manuscript structure is clear. The figures are of good quality. This study provides valuable information on the impact of mobile device utilization on mealtime distractions and metabolic health.	Thank you for your comments.
There are some small questions: 1. Why don't the authors include observational studies? For example, cohort studies, case-control studies, or cross-sectional studies.	We did include cohort studies and observation. “A cohort of 62 adults participated in experimental snack tests conducted over four days, during which various physical parameters (masticatory performance, swallowing threshold, masticatory frequency, and body mass index - BMI), environmental factors (presence or absence of distraction through smartphone use), and psychological variables (stress levels) were evaluated as potential confounding factors.”
2. When talking about “Renata Fiche da Mata Gonçalves’ study”, the author should provide the reference.	Reference is already given please check: R. F. da M. Gonçalves <i>et al.</i>, “Smartphone use while eating increases caloric ingestion,” <i>Physiol. Behav.</i>, vol. 204, pp. 93–99, May 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.physbeh.2019.02.021.
3. The authors should focus on their own study. They provided some figures about cardiovascular / kidney risk factors in the manuscript. But in my opinion, the authors should provide a theoretical figure about the complex relationship between mobile device utilization on mealtime distractions and metabolic health. That	I have included another figure which is my own picture and has not adopted from any source. Figure 7: The Complex Relationship Between

figure is important for your study. Maybe a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) figure is needed.	Mobile Device Utilization, Mealtime Distractions, and Metabolic Health.
4. The authors said “this study provides insights into the evolving landscape of diabetes prevalence in Australia”. Why do the authors mention Australia? And why do they focus on the diabetes prevalence? What is the relationship between this sentence and the purpose of this study? The authors are always talking about diabetes, but the title doesn’t include the word “diabetes”.	I have removed the sentence.
5. There are too many blank spaces in Figure 1.	The formatting will be adjusted by the journal. From my slide is correct.
6. How many adults use smartphone and tablet during meals in the world, and what is the percentage of smartphone use during meals?	I have included literature” As of 2024, approximately 4.88 billion people worldwide own smartphones, accounting for about 60.42% of the global population [15]. Specific global data on the percentage of adults using smartphones or tablets during meals is limited. In the United States, a 2016 study from the University of Michigan surveyed 1,163 individuals aged 8 to 88 in English-speaking countries and found that attitudes toward mobile phone use during meals vary depending on the activity and the people present [16]. Additionally, a 2015 survey by the Pew Research Center found that 88% of respondents believe it’s generally not acceptable to use a cell phone during dinner [17]. While these studies provide insight into device usage during meals, comprehensive global statistics are not readily available”. The reference is inside document.

Reviewer 2	
1. Title: • The title is clear and informative, but it could be made more engaging by emphasizing the novel aspects of the study. Consider rephrasing to something like: "Exploring the Impact of Mobile Device Use on Mealtime Distractions and Its Consequences for Metabolic Health: A Narrative Review". This revision highlights the review's focus on both the impact and consequences of the behaviour.	The author agrees and updated reference.
. 2. Abstract: • The abstract provides a good overview but lacks specific findings or quantifiable results. To strengthen it, consider incorporating key findings from the review (e.g., specific statistics or patterns observed in the literature) and mention the gaps in the current research. • For example, instead of "significant findings show a complex relationship," you could mention how many studies found specific patterns related to caloric intake, food composition, or postprandial responses.	<p>I have completed change and updated based upon your suggestions</p> <p>The present narrative review investigates how using a smartphone or tablet during meals can cause distractions and negatively affect metabolic health. Synthesizing evidence from existing literature, this review highlights that smartphone use during meals is associated with increased caloric intake, altered food composition, and disruptions in postprandial metabolic responses. These effects are mediated by reduced meal awareness and psychological distractions such as multitasking. Variability in findings arises from differences in study designs and populations. This review identifies critical research gaps, including the lack of longitudinal studies and the need to explore mechanisms underlying these relationships. By summarizing trends and patterns, this narrative review offers valuable insights into the complex interplay between digital device use, eating habits, and metabolic health, providing a foundation for future research and interventions.</p>
3. Introduction: • The introduction provides useful background but focuses heavily on diabetes prevalence	I have updated literature.

<p>without fully aligning the relevance of the topic to mobile device use during meals. • It would benefit from a clearer connection between mealtime distractions and the broader issue of metabolic health. • Suggest revising to succinctly present the core issue: how mobile devices, as modern distractions, may interfere with eating habits and impact metabolic health outcomes, particularly in terms of caloric intake and postprandial responses.</p>	
<p>4. Materials and Methods: • The methodology section is described in sufficient detail for a narrative review. However, it is essential to explicitly clarify the criteria used to select studies for inclusion (e.g., the types of studies, sample sizes, and geographical regions considered). • Ethical approval is not required for a narrative review, but it would be beneficial to mention if the authors reviewed any primary studies that involved human participants, especially those that may raise ethical concerns regarding consent and privacy.</p>	<p>Updated with your suggestions</p> <p>Ethical Approval:</p> <p>This narrative review did not involve any primary data collection or direct interaction with human participants, and as such, ethical approval was not required. However, the review included studies from peer-reviewed literature that investigated human participants. All reviewed studies explicitly stated adherence to ethical standards, including obtaining informed consent and ensuring participant privacy, as reported by the respective authors.</p>
<p>5. Results: • The results are clear, but some visual aids (e.g., tables and figures) could be improved for clarity. The current figures and tables do not always highlight the key findings as effectively as they could. For example: o Consider providing clearer titles and legends that explicitly relate the findings to the text. o Figures such as "Relationship between smartphone use, calories, and lipid profile" need more detailed captions and explanations. • A better integration of the narrative with the figures would help improve the manuscript's readability.</p>	<p>Included figure 7 for clarity.</p>

6. Discussion: • The discussion section appropriately contextualizes the findings with respect to the broader literature, but it could be strengthened by explicitly comparing the findings with those of previous studies. • The limitations of the study need to be addressed. For instance, the narrative review method itself can introduce biases due to the selection of studies and the subjective nature of the synthesis. This should be mentioned. • Additionally, consider discussing the potential physiological mechanisms through which mobile device use during meals affects metabolism, such as changes in postprandial glucose levels or changes in gut microbiota (as mentioned in the results).	Updated.
7. Conclusion: • The conclusion summarizes the review's findings but could be more impactful. Consider emphasizing the study's practical implications, such as how public health strategies could address the issue of digital distractions during meals. • A recommendation for future research on experimental designs exploring the causal relationship between mobile device use and metabolic health would add value to the conclusion.	Added statement "Future investigations should focus on the long-term effects of specific device activities, individual behavioral patterns, and interventions designed to counteract these distractions. By addressing these gaps, researchers can contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the intricate relationship between digital habits and metabolic health, ultimately guiding more effective public health policies"
8. Acknowledgments: • The acknowledgments section is appropriate, but it could benefit from mentioning any funding sources or institutional support.	No funding was available.
9. References: • The references are comprehensive, but some recent studies on the topic of technology and its impact on health, particularly from the last 5 years, are missing. The authors may want to include studies published more recently, especially those addressing the direct impact of mobile device use on eating behaviors. • Ensure that the references are consistently formatted and up-to-date with the latest research in the field.	We try our best to include all reference.
10. Language and Grammar: • Overall, the manuscript is well-written, but a final proofread is necessary to correct minor grammatical errors and improve sentence clarity in certain sections. For example, phrases like "significant findings show" could be reworded for greater precision. • Some sentences are unnecessarily long and could be broken into clearer, more concise statements to improve readability.	Proofreading was done.
Minor Suggestions: • Figures and Tables: Ensure that all figures and tables are consistently numbered and referenced in the text. Make sure figures are of high quality, and each one has a clear, descriptive caption. • Repetition: Avoid repetitive phrasing in the introduction and conclusion sections. For instance, the phrase "importance of the topic" appears several times and could be consolidated for conciseness.	Noted.

Reviewer 3	
1. In the introduction, while the paper provides a detailed description of the global prevalence of diabetes, it fails to effectively link this information to the research topic of the paper, resulting in a lack of close connection between the introduction and the subsequent research content	Updated.
2. In the materials and methods section, the paper contains contradictory statements when describing the search strategy. On the one hand, it claims that "We did not impose language restrictions in our search." while on the other hand, it states that "we only included articles published in English for further consideration." Additionally, the paper does not provide the specific number of articles ultimately included, which undermines the reliability and comprehensiveness of the research method.	The narrative review does not require to specify how many papers were included. This is not a systematic review. Moreover, I have updated the statement and clearly indicated on language specification.
3. In summary, the paper exhibits significant deficiencies in background, methodology, results, discussion, and image usage, failing to fully demonstrate the research's innovation and practicality. Therefore, I believe that the paper does not align with the mission of this journal and do not recommend its acceptance for publication.	The current paper is not a research paper. This is a literature review and there is no literature review published on this topic.