



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	2014_JSRR_12245
Title of the Manuscript:	Smartphone Addiction among University Undergraduates: A literature review
Type of the Article	Literature Review

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This is a growing topic of interest in the scientific and lay community, and a comprehensive literature review is a valuable addition to the literature.</p> <p>The abstract needs to be rewritten. For example, the design/methodology section of the abstract does not actually describe the methods of the review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The methods of the review are not included anywhere in the paper—how was the search performed? How were the included studies chosen? <p>The paper lacks organization and is difficult to follow. More sub-headings would be useful to assist the reader.</p> <p>Rather than a comprehensive review of the literature, this paper reads more like an annotated bibliography. It is simply a one-paragraph summary of various studies that have been conducted on smartphone addiction. It should be re-organized by TOPIC, not by STUDY, so that the reader can get a comprehensive understanding of similarities and dissimilarities between studies, based on specific questions/findings.</p> <p>Several relevant papers are missing, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jenaro et al. (2007) <i>Addict Res Therapy</i> Kawasaki, Tanei, Ogata et al. (2006) <i>J Phys Anthropology</i> Merlo, Stone, Bibbey (2013) <i>J of Addiction</i> 	<p>This paper is a literature meta-analysis, for it synthesizes and analyzes the information into broad findings and draws summary conclusions based on the findings (included in the abstract)</p> <p>As it is stated in the abstract, the structure of the paper is clear <i>"In the beginning, such concepts as the symptoms and levels of this addiction will be clarified. Afterwards, the underlying problems and methodological issues raised in the literature will be touched upon. The paper also reviews the relationship between Smartphone addiction among undergraduates and their academic achievement. Finally, significant differences in addiction among undergraduates according to their gender, field of study, parents educational level and family income level will be examined"</i>.</p> <p>-We think that this paper covers the most relevant studies on the topic</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Toda et al., (2006) <i>Social Behav Personality</i>• Toda et al. (2004) <i>Japanese J Hygiene</i> <p>The writing style of the paper does not follow conventional scientific writing standards. The writing is overly casual, contains slang, and consists of too much opinion without evidence to support it. It needs to be carefully edited.</p> <p>The English writing needs to be reviewed and revised by a native speaker.</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>The authors state that the term “smartphone addiction” will be used for the review, then go on to use many other terms, including: mobile phone addiction, problem mobile phone use, technological addiction, text-message dependency, SMS addiction, etc. throughout the rest of the paper.</p> <p>There are a number of typos throughout the paper.</p> <p>There are a number of grammatical errors throughout the paper.</p>	<p>The text has been revised by Prof. Adrian Roscoe</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>This paper has the potential to make a nice contribution to the literature, but significant reorganization/editing is needed before it will be ready for publication.</p>	<p>Changes have been made and revisions have been done</p>