



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN(O): 2320-5407 | ISSN(P): 3107-4928

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

[www.journalijar.com](http://www.journalijar.com)

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55613

**Title: Impact of Social Media Usage on Depression Among Adolescents in a Local Context – A Cross-Sectional Study**

**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. Arpith Kumar L M

## *Detailed Reviewer's Report*

The manuscript addresses an important and contemporary issue concerning adolescent mental health and social media usage in a local context. While the study has merit and relevance, several sections require revision to improve scientific clarity, methodological precision, and overall presentation.

### 1. Title

- Revision required:**

The title is appropriate; however, it may benefit from explicitly stating the **correlational nature** of the study to avoid causal implication (e.g., “association” or “relationship”).

### 2. Abstract

- Some statements imply **causation** rather than correlation.
- The conclusion in the abstract should be rewritten to clearly reflect **associative findings only**.
- Minor grammatical corrections are required for clarity.

### 3. Introduction

- The introduction is comprehensive but **lengthy**.
- Certain background statements are repetitive and can be condensed.
- Improve flow by clearly separating global context, local context, and study rationale.

### 4. Objectives

- Objectives are clearly stated and aligned with the study design.
- Consider simplifying wording for conciseness.

### 5. Review of Literature

- The literature review is extensive but **over-detailed**.
- Some references are repeatedly discussed with similar interpretations.
- Group studies thematically (prevalence, gender differences, platform effects) to enhance readability.

### 6. Methodology

- Study design and sampling are appropriate.

**REVIEWER'S REPORT**

- Clarify the rationale for selecting **Chi-square test only**, despite having multiple moderator variables.
- Consider mentioning why **multivariate analysis** was not performed (as a limitation).
- Correct minor typographical and formatting errors.

**7. Data Collection Tool**

- The description of the PHQ-9 tool is adequate but repetitive.
- Reduce redundancy and improve sentence construction.
- Correct spelling and capitalization inconsistencies.

**8. Results**

- Results are clearly presented and supported by tables.
- Ensure consistent formatting of tables and headings.
- Avoid interpretative statements in the Results section; restrict to factual reporting only.

**9. Discussion**

- The Discussion section is **excessively long and repetitive**.
- Several paragraphs restate results rather than interpret them.
- Causal language (e.g., "leads to," "causes") must be replaced with **associative terms**.
- Streamline comparisons with existing literature and reduce redundancy.

**10. Conclusion**

- The conclusion currently implies causality; this must be corrected.
- Emphasize **correlation and public health relevance**, not cause–effect.
- Shorten and focus on key findings and implications.

**11. Limitations**

- Limitations are appropriately mentioned.
- Explicitly reiterate that **causality cannot be inferred** due to the cross-sectional design.

**12. Recommendations and Future Research**

- Recommendations are appropriate.
- Consider prioritizing fewer, more focused future research directions.

**13. Language, Grammar, and Formatting**

- Numerous grammatical errors, spelling mistakes, and awkward sentence structures are present.
- Professional English language editing is strongly recommended.
- Formatting inconsistencies in headings, tables, and references should be corrected.

**Overall Comment**

The manuscript presents valuable data and addresses a significant research gap in adolescent mental health within a local setting. However, **major revisions are necessary**, particularly in the Discussion, Conclusion, and language quality, before the manuscript can be considered for publication.