

# Journal of Adolescent and Youth Psychological Studies

Open peer-review report




[Journal Website](#)

## Comparing the effectiveness of teaching study methods and time management on academic self-efficacy and academic self-regulation and biology course performance of 12th grade experimental sciences male and female students

Jafar. Saman Azari<sup>1</sup>, Sholeh. Livarjani<sup>\*2</sup> & Masoumeh. Azmoodeh<sup>3</sup>

1. Ph.D Candidate in Educational Psychology, Humanity and Educational Sciences, Tabriz branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran.
2. **\*Corresponding Author:** Assistant Professor of Psychology, Tabriz branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran (livarjani.sh@gmail.com)
3. Assistant Professor of Psychology, Tabriz branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

---

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Abolfazl Karami  Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran abolfazlkarami1@gmail.com	<b>Reviewer 1:</b> Taher Tizdast  Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran. Email: taheer.tizdast@toniau.ac.ir <b>Reviewer 2:</b> Meysam Sadeghi  Assistant Professor of Department of Cognitive Psychology, Higher Education Institute of Cognitive Sciences, Tehran, Iran. Email: m.sadeghi@icss.ac.ir

---

### 1. Round 1

#### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The paper should more clearly articulate the theoretical underpinnings of the study, particularly how study methods and time management training are hypothesized to affect academic self-efficacy and self-regulation. Expanding on the social cognitive theory could provide a stronger foundation for the research.

While the research design is described, further details on the intervention's content, instructional strategies, and how the sessions were tailored to address both study methods and time management could strengthen the methodology section. This would provide readers with a clearer understanding of the intervention's components and its applicability in similar educational settings.

The analysis section could benefit from a more detailed discussion of the findings, particularly exploring why the interventions had similar effects on male and female students despite potential differences in learning styles or needs. Additionally, examining any differential impacts of the intervention on various components of academic self-efficacy and self-regulation could provide deeper insights.

The paper should include a more thorough discussion of its limitations, including potential biases, the generalizability of the findings, and the intervention's applicability outside the specific educational context of Tabriz, Iran. Suggestions for future research that could address these limitations or explore the study's findings in different contexts would also be beneficial.

The conclusion could be enhanced by offering more concrete recommendations for educators and policymakers on implementing study methods and time management training in educational curricula. Providing specific strategies for integrating these interventions into existing educational frameworks could make the research more actionable for practitioners.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

### *1.2. Reviewer 2*

Reviewer:

The literature review could be updated to include more recent studies related to academic self-efficacy and self-regulation, particularly those focusing on interventions similar to the one studied. This would help to situate the research within the current scholarly conversation.

The presentation of the data in tables and figures could be improved for clarity and accessibility. For instance, clearer labeling, and the use of descriptive statistics, could enhance the reader's ability to interpret the results.

The manuscript would benefit from thorough proofreading to correct typographical errors, improve sentence structure, and ensure consistency in terminology and formatting throughout the document. This would improve the overall readability and professional quality of the paper.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

## **2. Revised**

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.