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

Shilpa Bandyopadhyay

As specified by the present authors, in this research they set out to examine the following objectives using a mixed-methods approach " a) What is the description of the digital resilience and academic skills of the Society 5.0 perspective? b) What factors affect the digital resilience and academic skills of the Society 5.0 perspective, and c) How are the digital resilience and academic skills framework of the Society 5.0 perspective?" (Page 8). However, as observed, the study reports the results of the preliminary analysis of psychometric measures on digital resilience and academic skills.

While this research is pertinent and important, it has the potential for significant improvement. Listed below are some comments that the authors might want to consider for the same:

Article title needs modification. Authors might consider revisiting the relevance and clarity of the phrases "digital mapping" and "in the perspective of Society 5.0" in the title.

Abstract: The abstract as well the entire manuscript needs to be thoroughly reviewed for language – to improve clarity and cohesion. In some instances, there have been abrupt transitions from one sentence and line of thought of another. For example,

The Covid-19 pandemic has changed the policy of higher education in Indonesia from conventional learning to online. This policy change encourages students to have psychological resilience and adaptability through digital resilience and academic skills. The research method is divided into two stages…

Rather than delving straight into the research method of this study, it might be beneficial to specify the objective of the current study ---- in the context of the two introductory sentences.

The abstract specifies there were 137 participants – there should be a mention of the participants in the first and second phase of the study, separately.

If the study measured resilience, it should be specified as low resilience and moderate resilience rather than 'stability' or 'strength' – as these might be conceptualized and operationalized differently.

The authors have used the term 'measurement construct' in the abstract and elsewhere in the article – it would be beneficial to specify what that construct is – particularly in the abstract when readers are getting introduced to the entire study at a glance.

Introduction: Authors are requested to thoroughly proofread, and review the language used in the introduction for improving readability.

Additionally, authors might benefit from reading published papers relevant to their field to note the structure of the introduction. For example, is it a tradition to have a separate introduction and literature review section (with headings)? Or is the literature review embedded within the introduction? Alternatively, would it make sense to have separate sub-headings for each of the primary concepts/constructs being explored in this study?

The introduction has mostly stressed on resilience and its relevance. However, society 5.0, digital resilience and academic skills being focal areas of this study – hence, these should have been explained and discussed in the introduction rather than being discussed later (under literature review).

Research Objectives: It is not clear how these three research objectives were addressed in this study (1) to develop a digital framework for resilience and academic skills from the Society 5.0 perspective for students at the tertiary level, (2) to map the digital conditions of resilience and academic skills of students from the Society 5.0 perspective in Indonesia, and (3) describe the factors that influence the digital resilience and academic skills of students from the Society 5.0 perspective. This study was only found to report the results of the preliminary analysis of psychometric measures on digital resilience and academic skills.

Literature Review: The *Freedom of Learning Policy* needed more elaboration.

In page 10, the manuscript talks about "In the extraordinary situation of change, the education sector will experience four decisive stages" … reference/citation needs to be provided.

In case of society 5.0 --- there has been an explanation of its relevance in Japanese context. There should also be an emphasis on its applicability in the Indonesian socio-cultural milieu – since this study is set in Indonesia.

With regards to academic skills, it might be useful to clarify what are academic skills in general and how are academic skills of society 5.0 different from those of previous times? For instance, were problem solving, creative and critical thinking not relevant previously? It is also important to provide the link between digital resiliency and academic skills.

The paragraph on the OECD 2030 Framework for Education that has been specified at the beginning of page 15 is seeming disconnected from the previous line of thought. There is a need to specify its relevance to the current research here itself.

Research methodology: It is unclear whose perspective it is when the phrase "from the perspective of Society 5.0" is used. Is it the learners/educators/general public?

It is said in page 15 that "As previously explained, the construction of measuring instruments in this study was adopted from the theory of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development for Digital Resiliency and the theory of Cassidy & Eachus (2002) for Academic Resiliency". However, the relevance of these frameworks for the current study

was not found mentioned in the previous sections of the manuscript.

To preserve the anonymity of the participants it might be better to keep the names of the participating educational institutions anonymous.

The ethical considerations followed in data collection must be specified (e.g., informed consent, confidentiality).

In which platform were the interviews conducted? During what times were the observations conducted?

The interviews were with students. However, were the observations related to these 21 students' digital adaptation or the school's digital adaptation? Please clarify and justify.

The methods section must be restructured --- if qualitative section was done first then it must be mentioned first followed by quantitative.

There needs to be greater clarity regarding the adaptation of the Connor Davidson Resilience scale in this study. It is currently unclear.

Results and Discussion: The results of the qualitative study are not reported. Further, the objective of conducting the qualitative study is not clear. The qualitative and quantitative findings have not been integrated. Please revisit this part and address it both in the results and discussion section. It must also be specified what specific method of qualitative analysis was done.

Please consider merging tables 4 to 9 so that there is only one table with all the sub-dimensions and their categorizations. Further, terms such as 'tall' and 'currently' have been used in the tables – their meanings in the context of resilience are not clear.

The criteria used for item total correlation needs to be supported with reference. Authors have not examined kurtosis, skewness, mean and SD values as part of item analysis – please explore the relevance of these for the current research.

In Table 11 it is not clear what the three headings mean (favourite, favourable, and amount).

Is the reliability value of .917 too high for the specified measures? How can redundancy of the items be ruled out?

Authors have not done EFA and CFA. Since their sample size was too small for those – they might consider collecting data from a bigger sample now to examine and validate the factor structure of the new measures. It must also be clearly specified if these two measures are new or adapted.

Some sentences in the discussion section are redundant – for example the last sentences of the discussion section explain the meaning of resilience and its relevance. The discussion should focus on talking about the current findings in light of existing research, the study limitations, and future directions.

Conclusion: should be in paragraph form.

Figures used: Was due permission sought for using the multiple figures presented in this manuscript? In some cases,

proper citations/references are not mentioned alongside the figures.

Referencing: It is not clear which referencing format has been followed. If it was the APA 7 format, then several instances, in-text citations do not follow the latest APA 7 format. Additionally, the reference section does not follow the APA 7 format either.

Consent to participate: This research did not require consent to participate– Please clarify the reason for not needing consent of the study participants.

In case of **author contributions** please specify who conceptualized the study.

Availability of data and materials: The authors declare that the data and materials supporting the findings of this study are available in the article – The data is not in the article. Authors might consider revising this.

Consent for publication: Publication permission for manuscripts containing information or graphics is not required – Please clarify.