



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>This paper should NOT be published.</p> <p>The authors did not address ANY of the comments/concerns from the review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Even basic, easy-to-address issues, such as fixing the inconsistent terminology, were not addressed• The methods of the paper were not added (e.g., description of the databases used, search terms used, method for selecting which papers were included/excluded)• Specific relevant missing papers that were suggested by the reviewer still were not included—with NO rationale for not including them!• The major problem of the organization of the paper was completely ignored• The writing style remains inappropriate (e.g., overly casual vocabulary; much opinion included with no support) <p>The current version is actually worse than the original, because now it includes statements that are completely erroneous! For example, now the paper states that “This paper is a meta-analysis literature review, for it synthesizes and analyzes the information into broad findings and draws summary conclusions based on the findings.” This paper is NOT a meta-analysis! It does not even include any statistical analysis. Do the authors even know what a meta-analysis is?</p> <p>Despite the instructions indicating that it is “mandatory” for the authors to respond to each comment, a quick glance at the Author’s Comments will show that there is NO response for 6/9 comments... and the 3 that were “addressed” were not actually changed in a manner consistent with the reviewer feedback.</p>	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer