

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_130083
Title of the Manuscript:	Building Academic Resilience through Positive Thinking - A Study of University Students in Syria
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant as it addresses the vital topic of academic resilience among university students in conflict-affected regions, specifically Syria. The study explores the relationship between positive thinking and resilience, providing empirical evidence that contributes to educational psychology. It offers actionable insights for policymakers and educators on fostering resilience in challenging contexts, emphasizing the relevance of optimism, self-efficacy, and social support.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. No changes are necessary.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Strengths: The abstract effectively summarizes the study's objectives, methodology, and findings. Suggestions: Include more specific details on sample demographics (e.g., size, distribution) and highlight key statistical results to strengthen the abstract.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The methodology is clearly explained, and the statistical analyses are appropriate. However, effect sizes should be reported to enhance the interpretation of findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are adequate and recent. The manuscript cites seminal works like those of Bandura and Seligman while incorporating recent studies from 2020–2024. No additional references are necessary.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable for scholarly communication, with minimal grammatical errors. However, some sections could be simplified for accessibility to a broader audience.	
Optional/General comments	The inclusion of visual aids such as graphs or tables to summarize key findings would improve readability. The discussion section could elaborate more on the practical implications of the findings for educators in conflict-affected regions.	

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:	Paul Agmabire Akendita
Department, University & Country	AAMUSTED, Ghana