

Paper: **“Impact of Internet on Academic Performance of University Students in Pakistan”**

**Submitted: 14 August 2021**

**Accepted: 28 October 2021**

**Published: 30 November 2021**

Corresponding Author: Nimra Nawaz

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n38p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n38p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Hadi Sutopo  
Kalbis Institute, Indonesia

Reviewer 2: Rose Mwanza  
South Eastern Kenya University, Kenya

Reviewer 3: Aslı Cazorla Milla  
Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Date Manuscript Received: 20 August 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 24 August 2021
Manuscript Title: Impact of Internet on Academic Performance of Students in Pakistan	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 79.08.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:    Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:    Yes/No	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
The title is clear and meets the content of paper	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>

The method of research is not stated in the abstract.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	
Using upper and lower letter should be careful. The entity should use upper latter. Example: “The above table 4 indicates ... “ – it should be Table 4	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
What is the research method? Experiment or case study? It should be stated in the research design.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
The results are very clear.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
Add citation from journal article to confirm the conclusion.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
The references should use APA style, so it must not use numbering.	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The paper is good and clear.

Authors need some revision:

- Describe what the research method is used
- Revise the references using APA style, without numbering
- Synchronize the text with the caption of tables and figures
- Be careful using upper and lower letter

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**This paper needs minor revision, especially at the method and references**

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

*ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Reviewer Name: Dr Rose Mwanza	
University/Country: SOUTH EASTERN KENYA UNIVERSITY	
Date Manuscript Received: 19/08/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 27/08/2021
Manuscript Title: Impact of Internet on Academic Performance of Students in Pakistan	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 79.08.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>(Firstly, the title is interesting and relevant. Secondly, the scope of the title is achievable)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(The abstract requires editing. There is a sentence, starting with the word “Especially” which is incomplete)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(There are several areas in the manuscript whereby work could be significantly improved: Punctuation; grammar; formatting the paragraphs by aligning the sentences in the whole article)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(The author to explain clearly how simple random sampling was used to get a sample of hundred students, and systematic sampling was used to select students from the five arts departments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(The results arguments are valid. The results also reflects significant contribution to knowledge)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(The conclusion is comprehensive and aligned to the findings)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(The list of references contains a formalized description of all the sources that are cited directly in the text of the article)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

It is a clear and well-written manuscript. The methods are generally appropriate although clarification of a few details should be provided, particularly further details on the use of simple random sampling and systematic sampling methods. Finally, the manuscript needs to be proofread to correct grammar and punctuation mistakes.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

The manuscript reflects an adequate understanding of the subject and a display of original thoughts and significant contribution to knowledge and consequently, the manuscript be published after the minor corrections.

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

*ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Date Manuscript Received:19.08.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 27.08.2021
Manuscript Title: Impact of Internet on Academic Performance of Students in Pakistan	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0879/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The title should be revisited because the paper is limited to university students. Therefore, the suggested title is: “Impact of Internet on Academic Performance of University Students in Pakistan”</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The abstract clarifies the methodology, results and the objectives of the paper. It is adequate to the journal guidelines as well. No further changes is needed.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>No major grammatical errors which need correction were found in the article. Proofreading seems adequate.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>This study methods were not mentioned with proper justification by the author(s). It would be better if there would more clear justification on why chosen this methodology. Also, usage of such models should be supported with more empirical data.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Overall, the results are explained however the paper does not add anything new to the literature or to the practitioners. I am not sure if this is enough.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The author(s) combined conclusions and recommendations which is somewhat weak. It is recommended to mention them separately.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>References are in APA style and up to date.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**