



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJARR_52990</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Thoughtful Overview of Social Media Usage among students and its Impact on their Academic Work</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

**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>)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The work done is interesting, well presented, and in general, presents a good originality and proposal both methodological and practical. However, I believe that there are some critical aspects that should be resolved before they can be published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The introduction makes a somewhat strange initial motivation and argumentation, lacking references or quotations to support such statements, and without actually introducing the objective, scope, methodology or approach followed.</li> <li>- The theoretical framework section requires a much greater effort to show the state of the current issue, as well as related works, with its quotations and detailed explanations. This part suffers from a complete systematic review of solutions similar to the one proposed by the authors. In general, I believe that this systematic review of other similar proposals should also be used as a common thread in the evaluation, comparing the results in specific scenarios obtained by the authors' proposal and others existing in the academic world.</li> <li>- The evaluation should include a much more detailed description of the methodology to be studied,</li> <li>- It would include a discussion section on the threats to the validation carried out (internal, external threats, etc.) in order to increase the validity of this section.</li> <li>- The conclusions are too brief. I think the authors can improve this part</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>David Lizcano</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Computer Science, Madrid Open University, Spain</b>