

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-58545**

Title: Emotional regulation difficulties according to addiction to the Internet and socio-digital networks in university students.

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- **098**

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Decision: Accept after Major Revision

Summary:

The manuscript addresses a relevant and timely topic, employs validated measurement scales, and includes an adequate sample size. However, there are significant issues regarding manuscript organization, methodology, statistical reporting, English language quality, interpretation of findings, and discussion of limitations. These issues should be addressed before the manuscript can be considered for publication.

Strengths

1. Relevant Research Topic

The relationship between Internet addiction, social media use, and emotional regulation is highly relevant in contemporary psychological and educational research.

2. Adequate Sample Size

The study included **381 university students**, which provides reasonable statistical power for correlation analysis.

REVIEWER'S REPORT**3. Use of Validated Instruments**

The authors employed:

- Internet Addiction Questionnaire
- DERS (Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale)

Both instruments demonstrated excellent internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha > 0.92$).

4. Ethical Considerations

The manuscript appropriately describes informed consent, anonymity, and confidentiality procedures.

Major Concerns***1. Weak Novelty***

The manuscript mainly confirms an already well-established relationship between Internet addiction and emotional dysregulation.

The introduction cites numerous studies showing similar findings, but the manuscript does not clearly explain:

- what gap remains,
- why this study is unique,
- how it advances current knowledge.

The novelty statement should be strengthened.

2. Research Question is Too Broad

The research question merely asks whether emotional regulation differs according to Internet addiction.

It lacks originality.

The authors should clearly state whether they investigate:

- predictive relationships,

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- specific dimensions,
- mediation,
- moderation,
- gender differences,
- or institutional differences.

3. Cross-sectional Design

Because the study is cross-sectional,

the authors repeatedly state:

emotional regulation difficulties depend on Internet addiction

or

Internet addiction predicts emotional regulation.

These causal interpretations are **not supported**.

Only association can be concluded.

Throughout the paper, replace terms such as

- depends on
- predicts
- causes

with

- is associated with
- is correlated with
- shows significant relationship with

4. Sampling Bias

The study used

voluntary non-probability sampling

from one university only.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

This considerably limits generalizability.

This limitation is not sufficiently discussed.

5. Statistical Reporting

The statistical analyses are incomplete.

The manuscript reports

- Pearson correlation
- regression coefficient
- p-values

However, it does not report

- confidence intervals
- effect sizes
- regression assumptions
- multicollinearity
- residual analysis
- normality tests

These should be included.

6. Regression Analysis

Only one regression coefficient is presented.

The manuscript should report

- R^2
- Adjusted R^2
- F-statistic
- standardized β
- confidence intervals

without these, readers cannot evaluate the predictive model.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

7. No Control Variables

Age

Gender

Daily Internet use

Academic level

Relationship status

are described but not included in regression analysis.

These factors could confound the observed association.

8. Discussion is Mostly Repetitive

Large sections of the discussion simply restate previous literature.

There is limited critical interpretation of the study findings.

The discussion should explain

- why correlations were modest
- why emotional confusion showed no association
- why inattention showed a negative correlation
- practical implications

9. Limitations Section

There is no dedicated limitations section.

Important limitations include:

- cross-sectional design
- self-report bias
- single institution
- convenience sampling
- cultural specificity
- inability to infer causality

REVIEWER'S REPORT

10. Future Work

Future research should include

- longitudinal studies
- multiple universities
- objective smartphone usage logs
- structural equation modeling
- mediation analysis
- intervention studies

Minor Concerns

English Language

The manuscript requires professional English editing.

Examples include

"the way young people are regulated"

should be

"how young people regulate their emotions"

Many sentences are excessively long.

Several paragraphs exceed 250 words.

These should be divided into shorter paragraphs.

There are many grammatical issues involving

- articles
- verb tenses
- punctuation
- awkward phrasing

Professional proofreading is strongly recommended.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Literature Review

The literature review is comprehensive.

However,

many sections become descriptive rather than analytical.

Several paragraphs summarize previous studies without synthesizing them.

The review should clearly identify

- unresolved issues
- conflicting evidence
- research gaps

Methodology

The methodology is generally acceptable.

However, clarify

- inclusion/exclusion criteria
- handling of missing data
- questionnaire completion time
- response rate
- sample size calculation details

Results

Results are understandable.

However,

tables would improve readability.

Instead of presenting all findings in text,

include tables for

- participant demographics

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- descriptive statistics
- reliability
- correlations
- regression analysis

Conclusion

The conclusion generally reflects the results.

However,

it again implies causality,

which should be avoided.

Comments to the Authors

This manuscript addresses an important and timely topic concerning the relationship between Internet addiction and emotional regulation difficulties among university students. The use of validated instruments and an adequate sample size are notable strengths. However, the manuscript requires substantial revision before publication. The novelty and research gap should be articulated more clearly, and causal language should be avoided because the cross-sectional design only supports correlational conclusions. The statistical analysis should be expanded to include effect sizes, confidence intervals, regression diagnostics, and model fit indices. The discussion would benefit from deeper interpretation of the findings rather than repeating previous literature, and a dedicated limitations section should be added. Finally, the manuscript requires thorough English language editing to improve clarity, grammar, and overall readability. With these revisions, the manuscript could make a useful contribution to the literature on Internet addiction and emotional regulation.