Review of IJERPH- internet addiction

Many thanks for sending me this paper to review: internet addiction (IA) is a growing phenomenon and problem, although with significant variation in rates across different countries. This paper examines the mediating effects of psychological inflexibility and experiential avoidance on its relationship with self-identity confusion.

General comments:

A. Both the title and the abstract were, on the whole, well written and reflect the content of the paper proper. I have a concern with the last sentence (see conclusion below).

B. The introduction gives a good overview of the literature and where this study fits into this.

C. The methods give a detailed overview of the study.
   1. Cross-sectional study
   2. Participants were recruited using self-reported questionnaires - a non-clinical population.
   3. The measures and the statistical analysis were appropriate and well described.

D. The results give a brief description of the findings. There is no description of the sample, or of how the participants scored on the various measures used. In line one, of Results, the authors state that the “means, standard deviations and correlation matrices of the measured variables are shown in table 1”. Unfortunately the means and SDs are not reported. Also the reader is given no information on the degree of severity of IA, or indeed what proportion of the population meet the criteria for this on the CIAS.

E. The discussion provides a reasonable summary of this study, and covers the area of comparison between this study and the existing literature well. The limitations are discussed in reasonable detail, however it omits the recruitment bias inherent to it methodology. The recommendation for ACT as a treatment measure is not supported by the evidence generated in this paper.

F. The conclusion in my view goes a little too far in its recommendations which are not adequately supported by these findings.

G. The references are profuse, relevant and up to date.

H. On the whole the tables and figures, are clear. However regarding Figure 2, the legend states at the bottom what is meant by values denoted *, but not for those denoted **