



**JOURNAL OF PUBLIC HEALTH  
STUDENT CAPSTONES**

**Author Instructions: Revise and Resubmit**

Authors who receive instructions to address reviewer comments and resubmit their manuscript should follow these guidelines.

When resubmitting revised work, upload the following three documents:

1. Your revised manuscript with tracked changes that address reviewer's comments (leave in reviewer comments so the editorial team can see you have addressed all comments).
2. A Clean manuscript that includes all incorporated comments and changes that were made to the manuscript.
3. A Document with corresponding answers to reviewers (example below)

When addressing comments to reviewers, please identify responses to each comment by indicating the following information:

- Reviewer #
- Comment # (copy and paste the comment)
- Statement of how you addressed this comment (copy and paste revised verbiage when applicable)
- Page number where revision can be found
- It may also be helpful to indicate with comments in the tracked-changes manuscript version where reviewer comments are being addressed. For example, the comment might read, "Reviewer 1's comment #4 addressed here."

Please feel free to reach out with more specific questions to [jphsc@jphsc.org](mailto:jphsc@jphsc.org)

Example Document:  
Addressing Reviewer Comments

**Reviewer 1**

**Comment 1:**

*“On p. 12, the authors state, ‘Results also highlight the role of anxiety on substance use behaviors and reflect challenges faced by a population not currently enrolled in school.’ This statement is confusing because some of the participants may be enrolled in school through remote classes and many participants have completed their education (58% of the sample has bachelor’s or graduate degree).”*

We thank the reviewer for bringing to our attention the confusing nature of this statement. We have now removed it from the manuscript on page 12.

**Comment 2:**

*“On p. 13, the authors state that young adults are ‘a group being hit hard by the novel coronavirus.’ Young adults have not been hit hard by COVID. It would be more accurate to say that young adults have been hit hard by the restrictions put in place to control the novel coronavirus.”*

To address this comment, we now have revised the manuscript to include recommended, and more accurate verbiage on page 12: *“This study serves a pivotal role in identifying entrenched maladaptive symptoms and possibly disorders among young adults being hit hard by the restrictions put in place to control the novel Coronavirus”*.

**Reviewer 2**

**Comment 1:**

*“With single-headed arrows, the path model is an implicit causal model. As such, it says that there are causal, or at least temporal, relations among the variables in the model. To the authors credit, they do not claim causality. At the same time, they also do not consider equally plausible alternative models that order the constructs differently. It is unlikely that the authors will be able to tease apart the various possible models with cross-sectional data. The authors should thus consider removing the path model from the manuscript.”*

Thank you so much for bringing to our attention the importance of considering equally plausible alternative models that would order the constructs differently, to support the model presented. We have in fact run alternative models, alcohol and substance use resulting in anxiety and depression, however, our originally hypothesized model does present a better fit to the data. We now include in the methods section a statement explaining we did run this alternative model, and describe the relative model fit in the results section (page # 8). We also have expanded the limitation section on the cross-sectional nature of the data to point out the need for longitudinal data to fully explore potential reciprocal relationships among these variables on page #10.