



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “The Role of Family Support in the Self-Confidence of Young People”

Submitted: 01 February 2026

Accepted: 02 March 2026

Published: 31 March 2026

Corresponding Author: Besarta Sadriu

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2026.v22n8p43](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2026.v22n8p43)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Rajasekhar Kali Venkata
University of Hyderabad, India

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

Reviewer 3: Gulshan Aliyeva
Khazar University, Azerbaijan

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Yes, the title is simple and clear.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

Yes, the abstract sections are also as per the required structure.

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

Yes, article do have several mistakes with respect to the writing of the article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes,

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

Yes, clear,

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

conclusions are also drawn on the basis of the results and okay.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

This is very weak part of the article, references are very very inadequate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The article needs to be written in a more authoritative tone and needs some language revision. The entire article may be corrected using some English editing service or some English language app.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title is clear and appropriate but slightly broad.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

The abstract is well-structured and logically sequenced. However, the sampling method is mentioned later in the article but not specified in the abstract. Implications are stated generally; a brief indication of practical application could strengthen the conclusion.

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

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

Inconsistent spacing. E.g. Methods: The study included 54 participants aged 18–25. Data were collected using a structured, anonymous questionnaire measuring family support (emotional support, communication, encouragement, and security) and self-confidence.

Results: Findings indicate a strong positive relationship between perceived family support and self-confidence.

Redundant phrasing: “positively influences the increase of self-confidence” better “positively influences self-confidence”

From the statistical table, it can be seen that the total number of respondents is 54 and there are no missing data, which indicates that the questionnaire was completed regularly and fully by all participants. The phrase "completed regularly and fully" sounds awkward.

The paper needs professional language editing and careful proofreading. Tables need formatting correction and standardization of statistical reporting, e.g. APA style.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The Methods section is generally clear, structured, and understandable, but it lacks some technical detail expected in higher-impact academic publications.

There is no information on questionnaire development process and validation procedure.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

The study is a solid, focused piece of research that effectively demonstrates the statistical link between family dynamics and youth confidence.

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

The Conclusion of this study is highly accurate and directly supported by the empirical data and theoretical frameworks presented in the text. It effectively synthesizes the statistical results into a meaningful psychological context.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is comprehensive and appropriate. However, I recommend adding references from the last five years that would significantly strengthen the study by showing that these findings hold true in the post-pandemic landscape, where youth mental health and family dynamics have undergone shifts.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the RESULTS 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]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper is well-written and provides valuable insights into youth development. The requested changes do not require new data collection or a change in methodology.

The manuscript is written in a clear, academic style that effectively communicates complex psychological constructs and statistical findings .

However, there is some minor repetition between the "Results" section and the "Hypothesis Verification" section. A final proofread for minor typographical consistencies.

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Yes, there isn't any problem related to title and the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

Yes, the abstract is clear. However, the authors can improve it and present more valid statistical results. There is only one point based on the survey results.

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

The paper should be checked again before correcting and submitting it.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods part of the paper has some problems:

- the small sample of the participants;
- as mentioned, cross-sectional research, but the statistical part of the paper couldn't support it;
- these points couldn't be highlighted as the limitation of the study;
- The authors need to use valid and reliable sources for the survey. When they prefer their own questionnaire, in this case, they should present it with supportive proof.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

The results part of the paper is clear, but there are some academic writing problems (tables, statistics are simple)

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

yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

yes

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
