

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58100

Title: *The Predictive Power of Problematic Smartphone Use on Sleep, Loneliness, and Cognition in Medical Students: A Regression-Based Analysis*

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 Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study:

- The study addresses a relevant public health issue among medical students
- A good sample size improves the reliability of the findings
- Validated assessment tools were used for data collection
- Statistical analysis is appropriate and clearly presented
- The objectives and hypotheses are well defined
- Results are supported with relevant tables and discussion
- Practical implications for student wellbeing are highlighted

Weakness of the study:

- Cross sectional design limits causal interpretation
- Convenience sampling reduces the generalizability of findings
- The study included participants from a single institution
- Self reported data may introduce response bias
- Ethical clearance approval is not clearly mentioned
- Some grammatical errors and awkward sentences need correction
- Cognitive findings require deeper interpretation and discussion

Reviewers Comments:

The manuscript examines the relationship between problematic smartphone use and important health outcomes among medical students. The topic is timely and has practical relevance for medical education and student wellbeing. The methodology is appropriate, and the use of validated instruments with regression analysis strengthens the findings. The results are presented clearly and are generally consistent with the study objectives. However, the manuscript should clearly mention ethical clearance approval from the relevant institutional ethics committee in addition to informed consent. The writing is understandable, although several grammatical errors and sentence constructions require careful editing to improve readability. The limitations of the cross sectional design, convenience sampling, single institution setting, and reliance on self reported measures should be discussed more critically. The interpretation of the cognitive function findings also needs further clarification because the reported effect size is negligible. Overall, this is a meaningful study that can be considered for publication after minor revision.

Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

The manuscript appears to be an original piece of research, and there is no obvious indication that it has been published elsewhere. No clear signs of plagiarism were observed during the review. A routine similarity check with standard plagiarism detection software is recommended before final acceptance to confirm originality and ensure compliance with publication ethics.