



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 after major revision

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

Reviewer's ID: JPR-198

Detailed Reviewer's Report

The manuscript addresses a relevant public health topic and employs a standard cross-sectional design. However, it has significant shortcomings across nearly all sections — abstract, introduction, methodology, results, and discussion — that must be addressed before it meets the standards of the journal. Additionally, the novelty of the study is limited given that similar descriptive studies have been widely published; the authors must clearly articulate what unique contribution this work offers.

Major Comments

- Title** - The title is long and repetitive. It can be shortened for clarity, for example: "*Knowledge and Attitudes Regarding Internet Addiction Among Nursing Students in Imphal: A Cross-Sectional Study.*"
- Abstract** - The abstract is not structured. It should follow a standard format such as Background, Methods, Results, and Conclusion. The methods and key findings should be presented more clearly.
- Introduction** - The introduction is very brief and lacks sufficient background information. The authors should include more recent literature and clearly explain the importance of studying internet addiction among nursing students.
- Methodology** - Several important details are missing:
 - No justification for the sample size (n = 150)
 - The questionnaire and Likert scale are not clearly described

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Cut-off values for knowledge and attitude categories are not explained
- Reliability and validity of the tools are mentioned but no statistics (e.g., Cronbach's alpha) are reported
- Ethical approval is not mentioned
- The limitations of purposive sampling should be acknowledged

5. Results - The results section repeats information already shown in the tables. It should focus on key findings only.

Degrees of freedom for chi-square tests are not reported. Some categories also have very small sample sizes, which may affect statistical validity. Figures are of low quality and repeat information already provided in tables.

6. Discussion

The discussion mainly repeats the results rather than interpreting them. The authors should explain the findings, compare them with previous studies, and discuss possible reasons for significant associations. The reported correlation ($r = 0.163$) is very weak and should be interpreted carefully. Study limitations are not discussed and should be included.

7. Conclusion

The conclusion simply repeats the results. It should provide a clear summary of the study implications and possible recommendations for nursing education or awareness programs.

8. References

Reference formatting is inconsistent and several references are outdated. More recent studies should be included.

9. Language

The manuscript contains multiple grammatical and formatting errors. Careful English editing is required before resubmission.