

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Advances in Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AIR_121413</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Interrelationship between social media addiction and mental health of emerging adults</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original research</b>

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript pinpoint the public health concern particularly to this core population of interest and it is worth publishing it after minor revision.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	It look okay	
<b>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.</b>	I urge the author to use structured abstract rather than non- structured abstract	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	No, I urge author to separate the discussion and results part and treat these part separately rather than of treating as the same part	
<b>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.</b>	This paper present a unique findings about the social media addition among youth and this matter is of public health important as we consider the public health implication of it.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	It look okay	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Methodology is ill explored , I do suggest the author should refine this part and include study design, sampling procedure, study site and study duration. Author may pay a visti to other literature and appreciate how this part is required to be presented.</p> <p>On top of that, Introduction part does not talk about the gap addressed, objectives of this study, rationale and aim of the study, all of this part must be articulated in the introduction part in the summarised way.</p> <p>Results should be a separate part and not combine it with discussion.</p>	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Majani Edward</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>St. Francis University College of Health and Allied Sciences, Tanzania</b>