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

Caroline Hands[1]

1 University of Liverpool

overall, an interesting and wide-ranging study, however this is very long would benefit from a little reworking to make it clearer. It may be worth considering splitting this into a number of shorter papers.

 It would be helpful if in the introduction you briefly defined some of the terms such as society 5.0 as the reader will not necessarily be familiar with these terms. A clearer overall framework leading to research questions is needed as it's not always clear what you are arguing, and the points you make in your introduction are not as well linked to the actual study conducted as they could be. Some linking sentences and supporting some of your points with examples would also help improve the flow of your writing. You might want to make it clearer whether the presented figures are yours or taken from another paper, little more explanation would be helpful here, for example do each of these contribute a similar amount to the overall model and do the colours or order they are presented in mean anything?

Both method and results should be split into qualitative and quantitative elements. Participant details are needed, how many people received the questionnaire , how many complete and incomplete responses did you receive and how does this break down demographically . A little more detail would be beneficial in terms of the interviews and observations, who carried these out, in which situations and how were these analysed? Equally when discussing the questionnaire it's not quite clear why this sample size calculation was done and what the results of this were? Generally speaking when collecting psychometric (questionnaire data) a sample size is based on an adequate sample which factors in the number of questions, with roughly 10 to 15 participants per question . So in a questionnaire of 10 questions you would seek to recruit responses for a minimum of 100 – 150 responses and then adjust this upwards based around the calculation you have done.

In your results it would be helpful to provide the score ranges and minimum/maximum values for your descriptive statistics, this would help the reader understand where the means and standard deviations sit within the data. Equally when discussing resilience as high medium or low it would be helpful for the reader to know what cut-off points were used and why? It's not clear why you've grouped some of these factors together, for example what does trust in instinct and tolerance of negative effects have in common ? - While a factor analysis can suggest groupings it's important that these are also theoretically similar, in this case it would appear that while students are rating these two aspects in a similar way they are actually separate concepts . Rather than providing separate tables for each of the sub domains this would be

better in a single table - again with cut-off scores and why these were chosen. It's unclear what the correlation table relates to (other than correlations within the measure) you also have not discussed any qualitative results or the SEM modelling referred to in the methods. If you are not presenting these results then remove the methodology from this.

In terms of your discussion I'm not sure that the descriptive statistics and allocation into high medium and low resilience alone tells the reader anything about these students ability to be resilient in the online environment, in order to test this you wouldn't have needed to look at this longitudinally and ideally compared with an outcome measure, for example did the student's with high resilience achieve better than those with lower resilience? You have also introduced a range of issues such as a lack of infrastructure that does not appear to have been measured by the study therefore it's a little tenuous to place the variance down to this without evidence. (It is likely that this played a role however without corroborating data I would be careful of presenting this as the explanation for your findings), equally you discuss the spiritual side however the results suggest that this only plays a tiny role in overall resilience, and here you would have been better discussing one of the more prominent factors such as self-efficacy. Ideally here you would have related some of these findings back to the points raised in your introduction rather than simply repeating the scores given in the results section and explaining what you feel these mean. Some of the discussion in this section would have been better placed in the introduction to provide a background to the study presented.

Your conclusion should bring together the findings rather than repeat the results a third time, these are simply the descriptive findings of your survey, a conclusion should address the wider problem identified and provide implications of the study.

There are also a few minor editing errors that could be addressed:

The references to Masten, Best, & Garmezy and Wang, Haertel, & Walberg both need a year, and should be presented as et al.

try not to end one sentence with a reference and begin another with further reference as this can be difficult for the reader to follow.

In some places your tenses are not correct and this makes it a little harder to follow try to keep in the same tense throughout each section.

It would be better in text to simply give an example of the questions and place the tables in an appendix at the end of the questionnaire.