

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_74230
Title of the Manuscript:	Assess the level of internet dependence and associated behavioral problems among the preschooler children
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, corrects the manuscript and highlights that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>I would like to thank for giving me the opportunity to review this research. Based on the data, the present research aimed at exploring the level of internet dependence and associated behavioral problems among the preschooler children. The authors conducted a non-probability method with correlation analysis, also exposed to limitations (e.g. not representative, the recall bias, the underreporting of internet use behavior, the cross sectional nature) of the research which described in a non-comprehensive way.</p> <p>Saying this, the suggestions are as follows</p> <p>Title: needs modification by deleting the term “assess” and adding where it was conducted and the study design.</p> <p>Abstract: overall it is poor. It doesn't show the nature of internet dependence among children, the severity and identified gap of the problem.</p> <p>The result is repeated and difficult to understand the concept what they need to say. What is the difference between mean score of knowledge and the mean percentage of knowledge score? It is not well summarized.</p> <p>The conclusion is not properly addressed based on the finding and the study objective.</p> <p>Abstract needs serious grammatical revision and consult language professional and avoid redundancy of single word.</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>It is not well organized and paragraphed. What the severity level of internet dependence in the study population, the factors affect it, the identified gaps and previous solution undertaken to reduce the problem and the reason why the authors interested to conduct the study are not well addressed.</p> <p>No use of references and presented in improper way. So it needs scientific citations rather than writing this like without acknowledgement.</p> <p>At which time internet dependence can attributed and what are the predictor behavioral problems? I am in doubt how the preschoolers use internet and become dependence.</p> <p>Methods and materials</p> <p>Where is the study has conducted and the study period? Why the authors employed non-probability convenient sampling technique? The sample size 100 is too low which difficulty to make correlation? What it the applied data collection technique?</p> <p>It is missed the important parts like sample size determination, sampling procedure, data collection technique, quality assurance and analysis way. So it needs a detail description of these parts. Even the language expression is unconnected conceptually.</p> <p>The authors said that “Consent was taken from the samples.” What kind of consent they received written or oral, if written as the participants are preschoolers, it is difficult to get their signature. So what action you undertaken to overcome this problem?</p> <p>Result:</p> <p>The result and discussion part needs serious grammatical revision and consult language professional because the document is still at the infant stage!</p> <p>The result needs subtitles in order to know the descriptive parts in clear manner.</p> <p>“3% of the preschooler children were disagree had internet dependence 4% had not sure, 80% had agree and 13% of them had strongly agree.” What does mean. It makes confusion for readers.</p> <p>“Mean knowledge score was 54.70±6.84and mean percentage of knowledge score was 72.93±9.12.” based on this mean score, can you interpret it? Since there is no operational definition, how the readers know the level of knowledge of internet dependence among preschoolers based on this result?</p> <p>“Correlation between internet dependence and behavioral problem among the preschooler children in wardha district.” This is incomplete statement.</p> <p>Since this is the result part, it should be describe your findings in here. The following statement can't fit this section. So please move it to methods data analysis section. “The hypothesis is tested statistically with association between internet dependence and</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>behavioral problem. The internet dependence and behavioral problem are compared to find association between them. Significance of association at 5% level of significance is tested with Pearson's Correlation Coefficient and tabulated 't' value is compared with calculated 't' value. Also, the calculated 'p' values are compared with acceptable 'p' value i.e., 0.05." There is no citation of the tables and figures in the text that makes to know which table/figure represents.</p> <p>Discussion The discussion should focus on comparison, reasoning for the variations, and giving justification that results the current finding, indicating solutions based on the guidelines and manuals. The first paragraph describes the result directly, so needs making short in conceptual way. Overall the writing of discussion was poor and not based on scientific manner. It is simply copy pasting of other studies finding without conceptualize and no citation. It is raw data. The authors need to consult experts on language, stastician, researchers to re-write a good and scientific research manuscript. Because it is still at the infant stage!</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	No	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Tilahun Kassew
Department, University & Country	University of Gondar, Ethiopia