PCI Registered Reports #487
Responses #Round 2

Thank you to Matti and Jana for reviewing our resubmission and once again for your thoughtful comments. We note our responses to the comments below, and our revisions are in track changes within the revised manuscript.

Comments (Veli-Matti Karhulahti)	Responses	Page (lines)
The MS now has a clear aim to explore mental health. However, how do the RQs connect to it? This was explained in the review a few times, but It might not be evident for reader. A simple solution could be to make it explicit in the RQs, something like this (just examples): RQ1: What are the motivations behind adolescent social media use → How motivations behind adolescent social media use relate to mental health? RQ2: What are adolescents' social media experiences? → What are adolescents' social media experiences in the light of mental health? RQ3: What are the views of adolescents of the risks and benefits associated with using social media? → What are adolescents' views of mental health risks and benefits associated with using social media? Such changes could clarify and ensure that findings both answer RQs and help measure development.	Thank you for the suggestions to improve the RQs and make them more explicitly align with the aims of the paper. We like your examples and agree that they improve the RQs, so amended these in the paper to read as per your examples.	9(202-205)
On page 10 you correctly refer to QHs aiming "to disclose and pre-register our hypothetical biases" (as we framed it). I would rarely pick a single word to change, but since RTA explicitly opposes the term "bias" (Braun and Clarke 2023 10.1080/26895269.2022.2129597: "don't mention bias", p.	We have now removed this sentence.	

4), you might just erase that one sentence, as the paragraph reads coherently without it too.		
Page 12, a sentence is missing a word: "This also recognises that some socio-demographic characteristics might more easily accessible to teachers than others."	This now reads: *"This also recognises that some socio-demographic characteristics might **be** more easily accessible to teachers than others."*	12(274)
The data sharing process is clear. However, what materials produced in analysis/coding are you planning to share? As I reread the MS, I realised you're using the term "document" (e.g., "We will document the process of theme generation with reflexive notes"), but this is not discussed in the ethics/data sharing section. Will the documentation be private or public? Based on my experience, it's good to decide/plan early on what materials will be public or shared with reviewers, as codes and their thematic iteration often involve identifiers and the de-identification process can be challenging unless researchers pursue it from the start of analysis. A good discussion of related issues can be found in Branney et al. 2023 (https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12728 [doi.org]).	Thank you for this reflection and paper suggestion. We agree it is definitely helpful to plan this out now at these early stages so we can build this work in as we go. Alongside the final thematic map and focus group transcripts we will use these reflexive notes to publish a 'reflexive journey' document as a means of tracking conversations and decisions around code and theme generation. We will also publish the list of codes underpinning each theme. We will add a note of this in the Stage 2 MS once we have a clear description of what is deposited.	