



### REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57402

**Title: Correlation Between Online Gaming and Academic Performance of Students in New Washington, Aklan, Philippines.**

**Recommendation:**

- Accept as it is .....
- Accept after minor revision.....
- Accept after major revision .....**
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

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

Reviewer's ID: JPR- 212

### Detailed Reviewer's Report

This manuscript investigates an important and timely topic: the correlation between online gaming and students' academic performance. The use of a mixed-methods explanatory sequential design is a notable strength, as is the inclusion of multiple key informants (parents, teachers, peers) to triangulate findings. However, the paper has several significant methodological and presentational flaws that must be addressed before it can be accepted for publication. The most critical issues are the very small sample size, serious errors in the presentation of quantitative data (specifically Table 2), and an overstatement of causal claims based on correlational data.

**Major Required Revisions:**

**1. Sample Size and Generalizability:**

- The study uses only 24 student respondents. This is an extremely small sample for any inferential statistical analysis (e.g., Spearman's rho, Cramer's V), making the findings highly susceptible to outliers and lacking statistical power. The authors must acknowledge this as a major limitation.
- Generalizability to the entire population of New Washington, Aklan, or the Philippines is impossible with this sample size. The term "significant correlation" in the findings is statistically meaningful but practically very weak. The authors should rephrase claims of generalizability throughout the abstract and conclusion.

**2. Critical Error in Data Presentation (Table 2):**

- Table 2 as presented is unintelligible. It is filled with the number "1" across all subjects for every respondent. This appears to be a formatting or copy-paste error. The authors must replace this with the actual grade data (e.g., numerical scores or descriptive levels like "Satisfactory") that they analyzed. Without correct data, the statistical analyses (e.g., for English) cannot be verified.

**3. Overstatement of Causality:**

- The manuscript repeatedly uses causal language that is not supported by the correlational design. For example:
  - "...playing online games affects the academic performance of online gamers positively" (Abstract, Page 1) – Correlation does not imply causation. It is equally plausible that higher-achieving students manage their time better and can afford to play games.

**REVIEWER'S REPORT**

- “students who spend more time playing online games... are more likely to achieve better academic results in science” (Page 7) – This should be rephrased to: “...there is a significant *association* between more time spent gaming and higher science performance.”
  - The authors should replace "affects," "leads to," "causes," and "results in" with "is associated with," "correlates with," or "relates to" throughout the paper.
- 4. **Contradictory Findings in Abstract and Discussion:**
  - The abstract states: “Our findings suggest that playing online games has had a negative impact on students' behavior rather than their academic performance.” However, the quantitative results (Tables 4-6) show multiple *significant positive correlations* between gaming and performance in Math, Science, and Social Studies. The paper needs a more nuanced discussion of how gaming can be simultaneously associated with both positive academic grades and negative behaviors. The current interpretation is confusing.
- 5. **Methodological Clarifications:**
  - **Snowball Sampling:** Justify why snowball sampling was used for the 24 students. This method often introduces selection bias. How did the initial seeds for the sampling chain be identified?
  - **Gadget Access (Table 1):** The percentages for laptops, tablets, and PCs add up to more than 100%, which is correctly noted as a “multiple response” item. However, the correlation tests (Cramer's V) using “Access to Gadgets” are confusing. How was this variable operationalized? Did you create a composite score or test each gadget individually? Clarify this in the methodology.
- 6. **Literature Review and Positioning:**
  - The introduction presents a balanced view of positive and negative effects. However, the study's unique contribution is not clearly stated. What did this study add that studies by Dumrique & Castillo (2018), Cabrillos et al. (2023), or Chen (2024) did not already address? The authors should clarify the research gap more explicitly.

**Minor Revisions:**

1. **Duplicate Abstract:** The abstract is printed twice verbatim (Page 1, top and bottom). Remove the duplicate at the top of Page 1.
2. **Typographical Errors:**
  - Page 2: “Inline gaming” should be “Online gaming”.
  - Page 7, Table 5: The table caption references “Science,” but the text above it discusses “Mathematics.” Re-check all table captions and adjacent text for consistency.
  - Page 9, last line: “thus, the only thing required is discipline” – This is an opinion, not a conclusion drawn from data. Remove or rephrase as a recommendation.
3. **Figure/Diagram Missing:** Page 3 refers to a “Diagram showing the process of collecting the data” (Conceptual Framework), but the diagram is not included in the provided file. Please add it.
4. **Reference Formatting:** Several references are inconsistent. For example:
  - Some journal names are abbreviated, others are not.
  - The reference for “NSW Department of Education (2018)” is incomplete (missing title of the specific article).
  - Ensure all DOIs are hyperlinked and functional.
5. **Clarity of Table 1:**
  - “No. of hours in playing online games” row has categories (1-3 hrs, 3.1-6 hrs, >6 hrs) but the “Frequency” column is empty. The text says 37.5% for two groups and 12.5% for the third (totaling 87.5%). This leaves 12.5% unaccounted for. Provide the correct frequencies.
  - The inclusion of “Online Sabong” (cockfighting) and “Online Casino” as games played by 14-year-olds is concerning and should be discussed as a potential ethical or behavioral red flag in the discussion section.

**Questions for the Authors:**

1. Can you please provide the corrected Table 2 with the actual academic performance data?
2. How did you ensure the validity and reliability of the researcher-made questionnaires? Were they piloted? What were the Cronbach's alpha values?
3. The study criteria required students who played “three to six hours every day,” but Table 1 shows 37.5% play only 1-3 hours. Why were these students included if they did not strictly meet the inclusion criteria?

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

### Decision Recommendation:

**Accept after major revision.** The topic is relevant, and the mixed-methods design is appropriate. However, the manuscript cannot be published in its current form due to critical errors in data presentation (Table 2), an overstatement of causal findings, and an undersized, non-generalizable sample. The authors must address the major revisions outlined above, particularly correcting the data table and substantially rewriting the discussion and conclusions to reflect correlational, not causal, relationships