



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN(O): 2320-5407 | ISSN(P): 3107-4928

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56438

Title: A Descriptive Study to Assess the Level of Knowledge and Attitudes Regarding Internet Addiction Among Students Studying in a Selected College of Nursing, Imphal

### Recommendation:

Accept as it is .....

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision .....YES.....

Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality			√	
Techn. Quality		√		
Clarity		√		
Significance			√	

Reviewer Name: Prof. Dr. Dillip Kumar Mohapatra

### *Detailed Reviewer's Report*

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

### 1. Strengths

#### Relevant Public Health Topic

Internet addiction among students is an emerging psychosocial concern, especially in academic settings.

#### Adequate Sample Size

Sample size of 150 nursing students is reasonable for a descriptive cross-sectional study.

#### Use of Structured Tools

Structured Knowledge Questionnaire

3-Point Likert Scale

Reliability and expert validation were mentioned.

#### Appropriate Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics (Mean, SD, Percentage)

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Chi-square test for association

Correlation analysis ( $r = 0.163$ ,  $p = 0.046$ )

### Clear Presentation of Tables and Figures

Data are systematically tabulated and categorized.

## 2. Weaknesses

### Poor Language and Grammar

Numerous grammatical errors throughout abstract and introduction.

Sentences are unclear and require major language editing.

Professional academic writing standard not maintained.

### Conceptual Confusion

Study measures *knowledge and attitudes*, but discussion often refers to "level of internet addiction."

No standardized diagnostic tool (e.g., Young's Internet Addiction Test) was used.

### Limited Originality

Similar studies already published in:

Asian Journal of Nursing Education and Research

World Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences

International Journal of Nursing Education and Research

## **REVIEWER'S REPORT**

No novel variable, model, or intervention included.

### **Methodological Limitations**

Non-probability purposive sampling limits generalizability.

Tool scoring system not clearly justified.

No ethical clearance number mentioned.

No power calculation reported.

### **Weak Discussion Section**

Mostly repetition of results.

Limited critical comparison with recent literature.

No theoretical framework discussed.

### **Statistical Interpretation Issues**

Correlation ( $r = 0.163$ ) is weak but interpreted as strongly meaningful.

Some chi-square values not clearly reported with df.

Multiple comparisons without adjustment.

### **Reference Issues**

Outdated references (2014–2020).

Some web links improperly formatted.

Limited recent (last 5 years) citations.

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

### ***3. Significance of the Study***

Provides **localized data from Imphal, Manipur**, where limited nursing-based research may exist.

Highlights moderate knowledge and moderately favourable attitudes among nursing students.

Could support development of awareness programs in nursing institutions.

However:

The study does not significantly advance theory or practice.

Findings are largely confirmatory rather than innovative.

Overall Significance: **Moderate (Institutional Level Only)**

### ***4. Key Points Identified***

Majority (45.4%) had moderate knowledge.

82% had moderately favourable attitudes.

Significant association:

Knowledge with family income ( $p = .036$ )

Attitude with gender, father's and mother's occupation.

Weak positive correlation between knowledge and attitudes ( $r = .163$ ).

Non-probability sampling limits external validity.

### ***5. Ethical Considerations***

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Ethical approval not clearly mentioned.

No statement on informed consent process.

Confidentiality measures not described.

This must be clarified before publication.

### ***6. Overall Recommendation***

**Recommendation:** Major Revision Required

The manuscript requires:

Complete language editing.

Clear conceptual distinction (knowledge vs addiction level).

Improved discussion with recent literature (2021–2025).

Ethical clearance details.

Statistical clarification (df values, effect size discussion).

Improved referencing format.

Rewriting abstract in structured format.

### ***JUSTIFICATION FOR MAJOR REVISION***

**“A Descriptive Study to Assess the Level of Knowledge and Attitudes Regarding Internet Addiction Among Students Studying in a Selected College of Nursing, Imphal”**

**Issue:**

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Title is lengthy and repetitive ("students studying").

Does not specify study design clearly (cross-sectional).

"Internet addiction" is not actually measured—only knowledge and attitude are measured.

### Why Major Revision?

Conceptual inconsistency between title and methodology affects scientific accuracy. Title must reflect actual variables measured.

## ABSTRACT

### Issues Identified:

Grammatical errors and unclear sentence construction.

Objective not sharply defined.

Methods lack clarity (sampling technique not clearly justified).

Statistical values mentioned without interpretation.

Conclusion is general and not evidence-driven.

### Why Major Revision?

Abstract is the most important part for indexing and peer review. Poor structure and language require complete rewriting in structured format (Background, Methods, Results, Conclusion).

## INTRODUCTION

### Issues:

Repetitive global statistics without recent (2021–2025) citations.

Lack of clear problem statement specific to Imphal.

No theoretical framework (e.g., behavioral addiction model).

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Ends without a strong research gap statement.

### Why Major Revision?

Introduction fails to justify novelty or research gap. High-impact journals require updated literature and clear rationale.

### *OBJECTIVES*

#### Issue:

Objectives mention "knowledge and attitude," but discussion repeatedly refers to "level of internet addiction."

### Why Major Revision?

Conceptual mismatch undermines validity. Either measure addiction using standardized tool (e.g., Young's IAT) or strictly limit discussion to knowledge/attitude.

### *METHODOLOGY*

#### Issues Identified:

##### 1. Research Design

Only "descriptive design" mentioned; cross-sectional nature not clearly stated.

##### 2. Sampling

Non-probability purposive sampling.

No justification for sample size.

No power calculation.

##### 3. Tool Description

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Reliability mentioned but Cronbach's alpha value not reported clearly.

Scoring criteria arbitrary (cut-off justification missing).

### 4. Ethical Clearance

No ethical approval number.

No institutional ethics committee details.

No written consent statement.

### Why Major Revision?

Methodological transparency is incomplete. Ethical documentation is mandatory for publication.

Absence of these details prevents acceptance.

## RESULTS

### Issues:

Mostly descriptive.

Chi-square values reported without:

Degrees of freedom (df)

Effect size

Correlation ( $r = 0.163$ ) interpreted as meaningful though it is weak.

Multiple associations tested without correction.

### Why Major Revision?

Statistical interpretation errors require correction. Misinterpretation affects scientific credibility.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

### *DISCUSSION*

#### **Issues**

Repetition of results instead of analytical discussion.

Limited comparison with recent studies.

No explanation for why income or gender were associated.

No practical implication discussion.

No mention of study limitations in structured way.

#### **Why Major Revision?**

Discussion lacks depth and critical thinking. Needs substantial rewriting to meet journal standards.

### *REFERENCES*

#### **Issues:**

Majority between 2014–2020.

Limited citations from last 5 years.

Formatting inconsistencies.

Web links incomplete.

#### **Why Major Revision?**

Outdated references reduce academic strength. Formatting errors require correction before publication.

### *ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS*

#### **Issues:**

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Ethical clearance number missing.

No mention of confidentiality safeguards.

No statement on voluntary participation.

### Why Major Revision?

Ethical transparency is mandatory. Without it, publication is not permissible in indexed journals.

### *SIGNIFICANCE*

#### Issue:

Study provides only institutional-level findings.

Does not advance theory, intervention, or policy.

Largely confirmatory findings.

### Why Major Revision?

Study is not rejected because topic is relevant, but manuscript must be strengthened to increase broader applicability.

## SUMMARY OF WHY "MAJOR REVISION" AND NOT "MINOR REVISION"

Minor Revision would apply if:

Only grammar corrections needed

Small statistical clarification required

Minor formatting issues

However, in this case:

Conceptual clarification required

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Methodology details incomplete

Ethical approval not documente

Discussion requires rewriting

Statistical interpretation needs correction

References need updating

These are **substantial structural improvements**, therefore:

**Correct Decision: MAJOR REVISION**

## Editorial Interpretation

The manuscript has **potential**, but requires:

Scientific restructuring

Language polishing

Statistical clarification

Ethical transparency

Updated literature support