Examining the Mediating Role of Digital Self-Efficacy in the Relationship Between Academic Self-Concept and Academic Performance of Students

Mahboobeh. Rezai[1*] , Zahra. Vahhab[2] , Fereshte. Izadi[3] , Fariba. Jahanbani[4]

[1] Department of Educational Sciences, Isfahan University, Isfahan, Iran
[2] Department of Educational Sciences, Payam Noor University, Vazwan, Iran
[3] Department of Educational Sciences, Khorasgan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran
[4] Department of Educational Sciences, Kashan University, Kashan, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Rezai.mahboob69@yahoo.com

Editor	Reviewers
Stefano Vinaccia Profesor de psicología Universidad del SINU, Montería, Colombia Vinalpi47@hotmail.com	**Reviewer 1:** Mohammad Salehi Associate Professor, Department of Educational Management, Sari Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sari, Iran. Email: drsalehi@iausari.ac.ir **Reviewer 2:** Sadegh Maleki Avarsin Associate Professor, Department of Educational Sciences, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran. Email: s.maleki@iaut.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introduction provides a broad overview of the school system's functions but lacks a clear connection to the study's research question. Please add a sentence or two that directly links the broader educational context to the specific problem addressed by your study.

The sampling method is described as purposive and accessible, but the rationale for choosing this method is not fully explained. Clarify why this method was appropriate for your study, particularly in the context of the study's objectives.

While the digital self-efficacy scale is described, the translation and standardization process for the Iranian context needs more detail. Explain the steps taken to ensure the validity and reliability of the translated scale.

The Academic Self-Concept questionnaire's psychometric properties are briefly mentioned, but it would be beneficial to provide more information on how these properties (e.g., reliability, validity) were tested in your study population.

The discussion does not adequately address the potential limitations of using self-report measures for assessing digital self-efficacy and academic self-concept. Please expand on how these limitations might have influenced your findings and consider suggesting ways to mitigate these issues in future research.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The reference to "recent years" and the growing recognition of non-intrinsic factors in learning is vague. Specify which studies or theoretical frameworks have contributed to this shift in understanding.

The discussion on academic performance and academic self-concept could benefit from a clearer definition and distinction between these concepts. Please provide more precise definitions, preferably with citations from seminal works in this area.

The statement "Students with good academic performance are accepted by peers, parents, and teachers and possess higher self-esteem" needs empirical support. Please add references to studies that have demonstrated these associations.

The use of Pearson correlation and structural equation modeling (SEM) is appropriate, but the choice of these specific statistical methods is not justified. Please include a brief explanation of why SEM was chosen over other potential methods.

The presentation of kurtosis and skewness in Table 1 is good, but it would be helpful to provide a brief interpretation of these values in the text. Discuss whether the observed values suggest any deviations from normality and how this impacts your analyses.

The correlation matrix is presented clearly, but the discussion in the text should elaborate on the strength and direction of these correlations. For instance, discuss the implications of a 0.30 correlation between digital self-efficacy and academic performance.

The use of goodness-of-fit indices is appropriate, but the text could benefit from a brief discussion on the threshold values for these indices and why the reported values indicate a good fit. Include references to guidelines or previous studies that support your interpretation.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.
Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.