Paper: **"Resilience and Academic Self-Concept as Explanatory Variables of Achievement Motivation Among College Students"**

Corresponding Author: Angelina Abaidoo

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Raúl Rocha Romero
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Reviewer 2: Olena Kovalchuk
Dnipropetrovsk State University of Internal Affairs, Ukraine

Reviewer 3: Judith Biirah
Kyambogo University, Uganda

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Raúl Rocha Romero	
University/Country: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México/ México	
Date Manuscript Received:13/06/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 22/06/2021
Manuscript Title: **RESILIENCE AND ACADEMIC SELF-CONCEPT AS EXPLANATORY VARIABLES OF ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION AMONG COLLEGES OF EDUCATION STUDENTS**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 32.06.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: **Yes**/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: **Yes/**No You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: **Yes**/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5

The title is sufficiently clear, it incorporates the study variables and the study population.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**
The abstract includes all the necessary elements. Is clear.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**5**
I found no grammatical errors.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
The Method section is well explained. It is clear and concise. However, it would be advisable to correct the hypotheses: Statistical hypotheses are an approach within the investigation. The report should incorporate theoretical hypotheses.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**5**
The results are good, although the Tables should be highlighted.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
They are fine. They incorporate the study variables in the discussion.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**3**
There are 12 authors cited who are not in the references. It is necessary to correct.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	**X**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
The article is fine, but it is necessary to correct the references. It would be convenient to incorporate theoretical hypotheses to the study and not statistical hypotheses.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
The article is very well worked. Theoretically and methodologically, it is fine. They incorporate a wide and pertinent bibliography. Just correct the references and hypotheses.

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Olena Kovalchuk	
University/Country: Dnipropetrovsk State University of Internal Affairs, Ukraine	
Date Manuscript Received:13.06.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 27.06.2021
Manuscript Title: **Resilience and academic self-concept as explanatory variables of achievement motivation among colleges of education students**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0632/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No It is up to the editors	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
The title "**Resilience and academic self-concept as explanatory variables of achievement motivation among colleges of education students**" is clear and adequate to the content of the paper	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**
The abstract clearly presents aim, objects and results.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**5**
The paper is well-written in terms of grammar and vocabulary. The authors used scientific language construction of C1/C2 level.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
The article contains the whole section called Methods. It is divided into following parts: design, participants and measures, data collection plan, data analysis. The procedure and choice of methods are grounded and explained. The methods are checked for validity and reliability. **The only thing I would like to be more detailed is to indicate the age of College students. It is written they are the first-year students. What is the proportion between males and females?**	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**5**
The explanation of results is clear.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
The conclusions are supported by the content. They are dived into two parts: conclusions and implications. I am interested to know if the authors take into account the mode of learning process in the pandemic period. Did college student encounter the lock-down period, these external factors can also have an impact on academic self-concept and achievement motivation?	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
The references are comprehensive and appropriate, there are 45 references. Along with classical works, the authors analysed the results by contemporary researchers.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	+
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	

Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I recommend this paper for publication.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Judith Biirah (PhD)	
University/Country: Kyambogo University (Uganda)	
Date Manuscript Received: 14ᵗʰ/06/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 2/7/2021
Manuscript Title: Resilience and Academic Self-concept as Explanatory Variables of Achievement Motivation among Colleges of Education Students	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0632/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**

(It needs to be changed to Resilience and Academic Self-concept as Explanatory Variables of Achievement Motivation among College Students*)*	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**3**
(It needs to be edited as suggested in the manuscript itself)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
(Yes there are errors I have highlighted that need to be attended to. See manuscript for detailed comments)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
(A few typos to attend to. See manuscript for details)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**5**
(No comment)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
(No comment)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**2**
(Most references are not in the reference list and some in-text citations are not matching those in te reference list. Outdated citations have been used which violates APA guidelines)	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	**X**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
The authors need to pay attention to the comments I highlighted in the manuscript.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
They need to ensure that authors put comments suggested to use so as to produce quality manuscripts.