

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_119693
Title of the Manuscript:	A study on Self – Esteem and Academic Achievement of Undergraduates
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript will inform the scientific community effectively if the discussion addresses both the significance and limitations of the research findings. 2. Agreed, however, the title should also explicitly mention correlation as a key finding of the research. 3. The analysis should be implicitly stated in the abstract. 4. Yes, but there are many missing detail: research gap, data collection and analysis, discussion. Then the correlational tests should be described in the methods section and presented in the results to ensure the alignment of the research problem with the findings. 5. Yes, but there is a lack of mention of the statistical tests for correlation (Pearson, Spearman's rho, or Kendall's tau). Additionally, there is no mention of assumption checks for these tests. The test results are presented without any accompanying discussion 6. The references are insufficient, and most of them are outdated. Additionally, the references do not correspond to the citations in the text, with many references missing <p>The conclusion does not correspond to the objective of the study. The conclusion could have provided more nuanced insights into main findings and the limitations of the study, such as potential biases in data collection or the generalizability of findings across different student populations. Additionally, considering the multifaceted nature of homework, the conclusion could have discussed potential challenges or unintended consequences associated with self-esteem that were not fully explored in the study.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, the language is clear, understandable, and suitable for scholarly communications	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is unclear whether the author is referring to academic achievement or academic performance. Additionally, the author does not clearly explain how these variables were measured to obtain the data presented in the results section. 2. The 'Results and Discussion' section lacks a thorough discussion. It only includes a brief interpretation of the results by the author, without a comprehensive analysis or contextualization of the findings. 	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ogi Danika Pranata
Department, University & Country	IAIN Kerinci, Indonesia