

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_99361
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of Problematic Internet Use and Cognitive Overload in Cyberchondria among adult IT professionals
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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/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><b>Compulsory</b> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p><b>The authors write "The study assumed a correlation research design to explore different variables affecting cyberchondria."</b></p> <p><b>There are NO data to assess the correctness of the analysis.</b></p> <p><b>The analysis of data is rather poor. The "experimental Design is with 2 Factors GENDER (2 levels) AGE (2 levels). Three (MULTIVARIATE) "Response variables" are to be analysed (PIU, CO, CYB). A BETTER analysis is needed, taking into account Factors, Interaction and Multivariability, especially because the data are not normally distributed and the "Response variables" are correlated. MANOVA, with Non-normal data, should be used.</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p><b>SEE above...</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Fausto Galetto</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Politecnico di Torino, Italy</b>