

## EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>As one reviewer suggested</p> <p>(1) the title could be more precise, such as: "Examining the Influence of Familial Structures on Social Media Addiction and Mental Health Among Emerging Adults: A Study in Karnataka, India". It is essential to add the country in the title</p> <p>(2) In abstract, add 2 sentences with conclusions - implications of the study.</p> <p>(3) In literature review studies, do mention the country the study took place: thus, it will be easier in discussion to identify possible (dis)agreement with earlier studies in India.</p> <p>I think due to the study's limitations and its short length,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A section/sub-section called "Limitations" should be added in order to mention the points not included in the manuscript (e.g., issues of validity and reliability of the instruments used)</li><li>• the authors could name it a pilot study (further discussion and interpretation of findings will follow in another paper)</li></ul>	<p><b>1. Title changed accordingly</b></p> <p><b>2. Implications and recommendations for policy makers was added as suggested</b></p> <p><b>3. In the present manuscript there is no separate review of literature chapter as such. It was included in introduction and discussion chapter. In introduction review is related to statistics so place of the study cannot be included and in discussion chapter results were highlighted accordingly</b></p> <p><b>4. Reliability and validity were not limitations as study has undergone through the pilot study before starting original research. Pilot study was conducted on a sample of 30 students to check the reliability of the tools. So details of pilot study was included as separate sub section. (\</b></p> <p><b>5. Other limitations were added as a separate sub section as suggested.</b></p>