

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_84677
Title of the Manuscript:	Clarifying the Impact of Social Escapism on Users' Smartphone Addiction Based on Technology Acceptance Model
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Grammar makes sections hard to follow; several typos as well thru-out The entire section on TAM lacks clarity-social escapism can be measured without TAM so why include it?? Study isn't about validating the model?? Not sure how TAM fits into smartphone addiction from reading this paper. Social escapism is/is not a factor in smartphone addiction? 11 hypothesis is TOO many for a single study. The work appears scattered/diffused. Links between H1-H3 to then H4-H6 aren't clear and then H4-H6 are not supported by the findings. Also, cannot infer causality from survey/regression. For example: H7: Perceived enjoyment increases perceived social escapism. Could also be Social escapism increases perceived enjoyment. Multiple sources cited BUT not listed in the reference list: Yavuz et al., 2021. Korgaonkar and Wolin, 1999 Hackbarth et al., 2003 Several http links do NOT lead to the page cited?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The link between Technology addiction, Internet addiction and Smartphone addiction is not well defined. The terms seem to be used interchangeably BUT they are NOT all the same?</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Blogs should never be used as empirical sources. IF Psychology Today published an article, then THEIR source (original study) should be used NOT the magazine blog! Use Dictionary cites for definitions but NOT for scientific relationships</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Carrie Carmody
Department, University & Country	California State University, United States