

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_127128
Title of the Manuscript:	Digital dementia: Are we getting dumb internet generation?
Type of the Article	Letter to the editor

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The topic of 'Digital Dementia' is a relevant one in the context of today's internet age. It is becoming more relevant as people's lives are increasingly becoming more digitized. However, the term has been around for at least ten years already and there has already been a lot of research on the topic from many countries. In that regard, this 'letter to the editor' on this topic has less relevance as it has not highlighted pertinent or pressing issues of digital dementia that hasn't been published already. It has also not made any reference to recently published articles in the journal on digital dementia that might warrant a response in form of a 'letter'. Most of the points stated are also rudimentary common facts. In that regard, the manuscript does not really add much to the scientific literature on digital dementia	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The topic is relevant but it has obvious English language errors. The correct title could be 'Digital dementia: Are we becoming a dumb internet generation?' OR 'Digital dementia: Is the upcoming internet generation becoming dumber?'	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Since the manuscript is a 'letter to the editor', there was no abstract for evaluation. The entire article could instead work as an abstract for a proper review or commentary article on digital dementia	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	There were no subsections in the manuscript since it was a short piece of 600 words. The entire manuscript is one paragraph only. However, there are still issues within the article with lack of clarity in Introduction, Body and Conclusion. A number of facts or evidence regarding digital dementia have been given but there is lack of logical flow to the ideas. Many of the given facts/evidence also lack proper citations.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	As a 'letter to the editor', the article falls short in various regards. The topic chosen is not novel, nor the argument presented impactful. The implications or utility of the article or its scope is also quite low. It might work as a blog article or web post; however, it is not appropriate as a scientific communication.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Since the topic of 'Digital dementia' has been around for more than a decade, there are already many studies and articles published on the same. However, this manuscript only references two scientific articles which is severely inadequate. The term of 'digital dementia' itself was coined by Dr. Manfred Spitzer, which is a critical detail that could have been added. Thus, the references are severely inadequate and the article comes across more as a opinion piece rather than a scientific article	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There were issues with English language and grammar right from the topic of the article itself. There is lack of clarity in a number of sentences, and the overall narrative is a weak one and lacking structure. There were also number of grammatical errors in the article.	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prakat Karki
Department, University & Country	CHRIST (Deemed to be) University, India