

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

Sahanowas Sk

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

- Page- 3 (2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph): Researchers have written "Every individual is born with the ability to have resilience" – is there any empirical research evidence? Then put citation.
- Page- 3 (2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph): "Pocetta added that 70% of youth who live in adversity are used to facing adversity and developing their abilities and skills to meet life (Pocetta, 2014)"- Researchers suddenly started this line while discussing the Nature of Resilience in that paragraph. This line should be put where the rationale of the sample 'youth' has been discussed.
- Researchers should rearrange the introduction portion where they put the rationale of the study, here the main variable is digital resilience' not psychological resilience or academic resilience. Researchers should discuss digital resilience as their main concern and how it is important in the present academic scenario in society 5.0. Further, they mention 'resilience' and academic resilience haphazardly without proper sequence or justification.
- In the 'introduction or rational section', researchers have not justified the keywords "higher education level". This term needs to be given concern before the objective is stated. Why did research choose this level? Why digital resilience is important for higher education levels, particularly in society 5.0, needs to be justified.
- In the "formulation of the problem," researchers mentioned "based on the "explanation above"-it should be written as "prior or earlier explanation or discussed earlier, etc." . Replace the 'above'.
- Researchers should write in a more concise or compact way in the "literature review" portion. Unnecessary discussion (like Society 5.0) may cause a lack of interest in the reader. Why the reader should read in such an extensive way about Society 5.0. It should mention the current scenario of society 5.0. in a concise manner that justifies the emergence or significance of 'society 5.0'
- In the page 15, last section, the researcher writes, "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" But they have not shown anywhere how they constructed or adopted both the instruments – Digital resilience and academic resilience.
- In the page 16, researchers mentioned using the "Connor- Davidson Resilience scale"- it is not the measuring instrument for "Digital Resilience" which is the main concern of the present study. It is a measure of psychological resilience. Psychological resilience was not the concern of the present study, as per the manuscripts. Researchers did not even mention in the "objective portion" psychological resilience. why they suddenly used the psychological resilience scale.

- Research outcomes were reported regarding psychological and academic resilience. But in the title, objective, and formulation of problems, they mention digital resilience. They described in the introduction portion what is meant by digital resilience, which is different from psychological and academic resilience, but did not report digital resilience in the result portion. Qualitative study outcomes should be reported clearly.
- In the data analysis portion, researchers mentioned applying "Explanatory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA),." "Structural Equation Modeling" But they have not shown it anywhere. It is suggested to mention clearly the techniques and statistics of data analysis and presentation.
- How the qualitative data has been collected, analyzed, and reported was not reported.
- The discussion portion did not properly follow the research objectives. The research objective was regarding the mapping of digital resilience, its influencing factors, which are missing from the research report and discussion. The discussion covered the results (percentages) on psychological resilience and academic resilience.
- In the study, research should mention the limitations of the study, which need to be addressed by future researchers.