

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_113206
Title of the Manuscript:	Substance Use, Peer Social Comparison, Academic Stress and Psychological Well-Being of Students in Tertiary Institution in Delta South Senatorial District
Type of the Article	Research based article

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1 This article is important for scientific community. It deals with an important area covering adolescent students living in tertiary institution and Delta South Senatorial Dist. The researcher has examined to what extent the mental well being of the students is related to a complex interplay of substance use, peer social comparison, academic stress and psychological well being. Using standardized tools (after ensuring reliability and validity of each tool), the researcher has investigated the problem mentioned above on a total sample of 332 students. Based on the findings the researcher has recommended holistic mental health programme in such institutions.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable. There is no need to change the title.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. No, the researcher has not made any headings and sub headings or present the article in sections clearly structured. In fact I would like to point out for instance the author could have presented under operational definitions, (i) Psychological Well being; (ii) Poor psychological well being (iii) substance use (iv) Peer social comparison (v) academic stress etc. (This operational definition could have followed the formulation of hypotheses also. If such structure was used and the variables presented in a cogent, precise, to the point and comprehensible manner, the articles would have been more meaningful. It would have helped avoid repetition and made article more precise, meaningful and relevant.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. Yes, they are absolutely recent, sufficient and adequate. One or two relevant studies though in the context of Pandemic could have been cited. Also the study by Camille Zolopa, et al (2022) in the journal <i>Adolesc Res Rev.</i> 2022; 7(2): 161–17 is a study that covers almost all aspects covered by the present author</p> <p><u>Other points from the reviewer</u></p> <p>1 Considerable editing, restructuring and presenting the material section and subsectionwise are required and should be carried out before publishing it.</p> <p>2 Large number of repetitions which should be omitted. Present to the point highlighting the typical features of the variables used. This would make the article readable. In other words, the author should put together all factors (nearly 13 of them) related to poor psychological well being under one sub-heading.</p> <p>3 It is wrong to treat synonymously 'psychological well being' with 'mental well being' Mental health or mental well being refers to understanding and managing one's emotions, thoughts, and overall mental state. On the other hand, psychological well being or psychological health delves deeper and refers to the 'why' behind the person's emotional and mental experiences.</p> <p>5 In page 4 the longitudinal studies in Japan has been mentioned which appear not very relevant to study. Could be avoided.</p> <p>6. The variables substance use, peer social comparison, academic stress and psychological well being should have been operationally defined for the study.</p> <p>7. Page 8 para 2 should be omitted and it is totally repetitive.</p> <p>8 The hypothesis have been well formulated as " null hypotheses" and are adequate.</p> <p>9. The selection of sample is multistage sampling. However, the author has not clearly mentioned if the final sample(N=332) selected for the study is representative and therefore the results are generalisable.</p> <p>10. While hypothesis testing has been empirically well handled, the regression analysis suffers from certain inadequacy. For instance, in regression analysis the researcher has definitely checked the model fit with the F value showing a high significance level. However, the researcher will have to interpret regression appropriately. He has to discuss R^2, β and the t-value. He has to explain and interpret how "well being" scores are influenced by some of the important factors. He needs to more specifically mention whether the predicted values match the observed values and how much of the variation is explained by independent variable (though has mentioned it in the passing in one of the hypothesis testing). The researcher should have looked for a high R^2, low standard error, and if residuals are normally distributed without outlier. These need to have been mentioned.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	It is seen that every hypothesis has been taken up very well and empirically tested. To assess the validity, the researcher must indicate whether the assumptions of the regression method are met, such as linearity, independence, homoscedasticity, and normality. He should have indicated if there has been any potential confounding factors, omitted variables, or endogeneity issues that might have probably biased the results. For this if necessary he could have suggested or even added control variables..	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1 The language /English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. It is very appropriate and correct.	
Optional/General comments	If properly edited and repetitions avoided and rewrite the regressiona analysis and interpretation, this article can be published in the journal refer to.	

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:	Vimala Veeraraghavan
Department, University & Country	Apeejay Stya University, India