

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

Sri Nurhayati Selian<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universitas Muhammadiyah Aceh

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Title & Abstract

1. Do the title and abstract cover the main aspect of the work?
  - a. The title should be revisited. Create a title that describes the contents of the article. Keep the title short and concise.
  - b. Keywords sort by alphabet

## Introduction

2. Does the introduction provide background and information relevant to the study?
  - a. It is suggested that the introduction ends by mentioning the research objectives.
  - b. After explaining the Figure 1 section, please explain how Figure 1 relates to the current research variables.

## Formulation of the Problems

3. Research questions must be in sync with the research objectives.

## Material and Methods

4. Are the methods clear and replicable? Do all the results presented match the methods described?
  - a. Explain the reference that says participation for the pilot study allows using less than 30 people.
  - b. Explain the formula or reference for the use of 116 participants. State your justification.
  - c. Justify how this number (116) came out in this study?

## Quantitative Data Collection Techniques

5. The formula that is described should indicate the sample size and the study population.

## Results

6. The research results must answer the research questions and research objectives. Sort the answers according to the research question.

7. Please, add qualitative research results, the paper does not show qualitative research results.

### **Discussion**

8. Discuss the results of qualitative and quantitative research, adding by mentioning the limitations of this research.

### **Conclusion**

9. Explain for the conclusion of qualitative results as well, add by mentioning the implications of this research.

### **Recommendations to the Editor**

10. Recommendations to Editors: Good, acceptable for publication after researchers make some improvements.