

Review of: "Digital Mapping of Resilience and Academic Skills in the Perspective of Society 5.0 for Higher Education Level Students"

Romell Ramos¹

¹ University of Batangas

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The problem/topic is timely and relevant as this provides educators with a framework for higher education students' resilience and academic skills with consideration of Society 5.0.

Here are my comments, and please consider my suggestions.

1. Abstract: The background of the problem is presented, but the main objective is missing. The specific qualitative and quantitative designs are not indicated (e.g., survey, interview, etc.). The "new" insights, discoveries, and implications of the study results and findings should be highlighted. Also, there is confusion among the terms "digital mapping of resiliency", "mapping of digital resiliency", and "academic resilience, which are obviously three different things. Be consistent with the terminologies used.
2. Introduction: The review of related literature is commendable. The research problem and objectives are clearly presented. However, the conceptual paradigm presented in the study does not include academic skills. The discussion about the variables "digital resilience" and "academic skills" are confusing since ideas/concepts such as academic resiliency are also added. Coherently and consistently present the concepts and constructs to avoid confusion.
3. Methodology: Specify the quantitative and qualitative methods used. The data analysis techniques and procedures for the qualitative data are not clearly presented. Selection and inclusion/exclusion criteria for samples are not discussed. Who were included as respondents in the interview and survey?
4. Results and Discussion: The statistical results for CFA or EFA are not presented (model fit, VFI, convergent validity, discriminant validity, etc.), which are necessary for SEM analysis. Also, you need to consider whether the items are reflective or formative in nature.
5. References: Use recent literature and studies, preferably from 2018 to present.