Paper: **"The Relationship Between Intrinsic Religiosity and Resilience Among Tunisian Female University Students"**

Corresponding Author: Salma Derouiche-El Kamel

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Stankovska Gordana
University of Tetova, Republic of Macedonia

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
Yes.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract should be revised. Please discard citations or scale names, instead focus on variables.
The final sentence should be rephrased since the meaning is vague.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
"Koenig et al (2001) suggest" → "Koenig et al. (2001) suggest" (Missing period after "al.")
"Koenig et al., 2001; Puchalski et al., 2009" → "Koenig et al. (2001); Puchalski et al. (2009)" (Inconsistent citation style; should match the rest of the text.)
"As for Religiosity, it refers to behaviours" → "As for religiosity, it refers to behaviours" ("Religiosity" should not be capitalized.)

There are many mistakes like these. I suggest authors to review paper in terms of grammar.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
More explanations are needed regarding sampling and data collection procedures.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
The literature part as well as the discussion can be improved. Since the model is extremely simple with two variables you should definitely improve your discussions. For example how your findings are related to belief in fate e.g., https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12208-023-00383-5 or how it differs from previous studies e.g., https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4029596/
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
I suggest authors merging the discussion and conclusion sections or try to improve the conclusion section.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
It is okay.
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Please carefully evaluate the points I shared above.

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title is clear enough and corresponds to the content.Fully meats results and discussio.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract contains all necessary elements: purpose, methods, and results. The abstract is acceptable.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
There is no grammatical mistakes.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
The study very good and clear explains the relationship between intrinsic religiosity and resilience among Tunisian female university students.At the same time the authors used linear regression model to see if intrinsic religiosity predict resilience scores. So the study methods are well chosen, appropriately used, and clearly explained.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
The body of the paper is very clear. It consists all parts and every part is good done and explained. Also the authors explained their results very clear using tables and figures, and after that they discussed them.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The conclusions are very clear and are in the context with the main aim of the paper.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
The references are in the context of the article.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
The paper is very good from theoretical and empirical aspects.

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
Yes, the title "The Relationship Between Intrinsic Religiosity and Resilience Among
Tunisian Female University Students" is clear and adequately reflects the content of
the article.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
Yes, the abstract clearly presents the objectives, methods, and results, but it could be
improved by emphasizing the effect size and refining the conclusion to prevent
overstating the findings.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Yes, the manuscript contains grammatical errors, spelling inconsistencies, and formatting issues that could be improved by revision. However, the overall structure and readability are strong. A final proofreading pass focusing on grammar, redundancy, and APA formatting would enhance clarity and professionalism.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes, the study methods are clearly explained, but minor improvements could enhance clarity and rigor:

✔️ Strengths: Clear participant details, justified measures, and well-defined statistical approach.

❌ Needs Improvement: Include scale reliability, missing data handling, sample size justification, and covariate control in regression.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Suggestions

✔️ The body of the paper is clear and well-structured.

❌ Some errors exist in grammar, clarity, statistical interpretation, and APA formatting.

📌 Recommended Revisions:

Fix wordiness, subject-verb agreement, and preposition errors.

Improve statistical interpretation (emphasizing the small effect size).

Correct APA formatting for citations and tables.

Make the discussion more balanced by incorporating contradictory findings.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Suggestions:

✔️ Mostly supported by the content but with some overstatements.

❌ Needs a more substantial acknowledgment of limitations and alternative resilience factors.

🔷 Suggested Revisions:

Clarify that religiosity explains only a tiny portion of resilience.

Expand the limitations section (self-report bias, cultural context, missing predictors).

Discuss practical implications for mental health and student support.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Suggestions

✔️ The references are generally appropriate and comprehensive.

❌ However, there are issues with outdated sources, APA formatting, missing citations, and inconsistent DOI formatting.

🔷 Recommended Revisions:

Update older sources with recent resilience and religiosity research (post-2020).

Fix APA formatting issues (et al., journal titles, DOIs, and spacing).

Ensure all sources in the reference list are cited in the text.

Check for missing citations in the reference list (e.g., Qur'an citation).

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Final Decision:
✅ "Accepted with Minor Revisions"
📌 The paper does not require significant restructuring or additional data collection but needs minor edits to improve clarity, APA formatting, and discussion balance.

Revisions Needed:
Clarity & Grammar: Minor grammatical errors, wordiness, and occasional awkward phrasing need correction.
Statistical Interpretation: The discussion should emphasize the small effect size ($R^2 = 0.055$) to avoid overstating religiosity's impact on resilience.
References & APA Formatting: Several APA errors (missing spaces, incorrect citation formatting, inconsistent DOI presentation) need to be corrected.
Limitations Section Needs Expansion: The conclusion should better acknowledge the study's limitations, including self-report bias and other unmeasured resilience factors.

Reviewer E:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
It is clear and adequate to the content.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
Yes, it does.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
The language seems to be of schoalrly value.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
Yes, they are.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
Yes, it is clear, and I have not seen errors.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
It is.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
Yes, the references are new and vast.
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
From my humble perspective, there is no clear difference between this research and those mentioned in the discussion section. There is ambiguity about the relationship between the phenomena. Still, I do not quite understand why the current research is supposed to solve it - just by replicating the design and providing evidence to one side of the ambiguity?