

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_96172
Title of the Manuscript:	CORRELATION BETWEEN ANXIETY AND SMARTPHONE ADDICTION IN THE TEENAGER POPULATION at KALAM KUDUS II SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Quite important, because the correlation between anxiety and smartphone use in teenagers is well observed. Better to study specific variables in the topic that haven't been studied before.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Structurally yes, The Discussion section haven't discuss the findings of the study. Researchers should discuss the findings and compare it to past studies and analyze the gap and the prospects.</p> <p>5. Yes, but the conclusion is not broadened to the extent that even though there's a significant correlation but the correlation coefficient is low, meaning it's not strongly correlated.</p> <p>6. Resources for explaining the background of the research should be taken from textbooks and well recognized journals with high impact factors to better explain the basic theory such as about anxiety, addiction, and psychological features of adolescents.</p> <p>Additional comment: Please describe the assessment tool used to determine smartphone addiction because it have to be a well validated one to make this research feasible. Does it have a cut off point?</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Quite, need more improvements	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ireine Suantika Cornelia Roosdy
Department, University & Country	Sam Ratulangi University, Indonesia