

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_121795</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Social media addiction and mental health of emerging adults: Associated familial factors</b>
Type of the Article	<b>ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript addresses a significant topic in the field of psychology, specifically focusing on the impact of familial factors on social media addiction and mental health in emerging adults. The study is timely in terms of implications for academic research and practical interventions in mental health and family studies. However, the manuscript requires huge revisions in order to level it up with a scientifically rigorous study. Methodology, discussion, and interpretation of results should be further strengthened to enhance the credibility and trustworthiness of the findings.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The existing title is descriptive yet imprecise. A more precise and specific title might be: "Examining the Influence of Familial Structures on Social Media Addiction and Mental Health Among Emerging Adults: A Study in Karnataka, India" This revised title more accurately represents the study's breadth and regional emphasis.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a good overview but needs refinement for clarity and completeness. Suggested revisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The abstract mentions the use of a survey without specifying the sampling technique, which is critical for evaluating the study's validity.</li> <li>2. The results section of the abstract lacks specific statistical details such as p-values, which are essential for assessing the significance of the findings.</li> <li>3. The conclusion in the abstract is weak and lacks actionable insights. It should succinctly state the broader implications of the findings for the scientific community and possible applications in policy or practice.</li> </ol>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure of the manuscript is generally appropriate; however, several critical issues need to be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Introduction:</b> The literature review is superficial and does not sufficiently justify the study. The introduction should include a more comprehensive and critical review of recent studies on social media addiction and mental health, particularly in the context of familial influences. There is also a lack of theoretical grounding; the study would benefit from being framed within a well-established theoretical model, such as Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory, which could provide a more robust framework for understanding the influence of family structures on individual behavior and mental health.</li> <li>2. <b>Methodology:</b> The methodology section is one of the weakest parts of the manuscript. Critical details are missing:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1. <b>Sampling:</b> The sampling method is not described, raising concerns about the representativeness and generalizability of the findings. There is no indication of whether random sampling, stratified sampling, or another method was used. The lack of a sample size calculation or justification is a serious oversight. A power analysis should have been conducted to ensure the study was adequately powered to detect significant effects.</li> <li>2.2. <b>Measurement Tools:</b> The validity and reliability of the instruments used (Social Media Addiction Tool by Tutgan and Deniz, and Mental Health Inventory by Jagadish and Srivastava) are not discussed. The manuscript should provide evidence that these tools are appropriate for the population being studied, including any validation studies conducted in the Indian context.</li> <li>2.3. <b>Statistical Analysis:</b> The description of statistical methods is inadequate. The</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	

**Review Form 3**

	manuscript mentions the use of frequency, percentages, and correlation, but it does not justify why these methods were chosen or how they align with the study's objectives. Furthermore, the handling of potential confounding variables is not discussed, which is a critical omission in a study of this nature.	
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.	The statistical analysis methods are appropriate for the study's objectives. However, the interpretation of the results is superficial. The discussion section largely reiterates the findings without providing a deep analysis or exploring alternative explanations. There is a lack of engagement with contradictory findings from the literature, and the discussion does not critically assess the study's limitations or the potential impact of these limitations on the results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are generally sufficient but should include more recent studies to provide update context. Consider adding studies from the past five years to enhance the literature review and discussion sections.	
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript needs careful proofreading to correct grammatical errors and improve readability. For example, the sentence "The negative effects of social media are also come to the surface when used it excessively" should be revised for clarity to "The negative effects of social media also become apparent when it is used excessively."	
Optional/General comments	While the manuscript addresses an important and timely topic, it falls short of the rigor expected in a scientific study. Authors need to revise it significantly by addressing methodological weaknesses, improving the literature review, and offering a more critical analysis of the findings to contribute meaningfully to the field.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	Rasool Hamidi Choolabi
Department, University & Country	Ahrar Institute of Technology and Higher Education, Iran