


The Dynamics of Academic Buoyancy in Contemporary Education

Fereydon. Eslami¹, Roodabeh. Hooshmandi^{1*}



¹ Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada

* Corresponding author email address: fereydonehlami@kmanresce.ca

Editor

Nadereh Saadati¹
Department of Psychology and
Counseling, KMAN Research
Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario,
Canada
nsaadati@kmanresce.ca

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Mehdi. Ghezelsefloo¹
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Gonbad Kavos University, Gonbad
Kavos, Iran. Email: ghezelsefloo@gonbad.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Seyed Hadi Seyed Alitabar¹
Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond
Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: hadialitabar@kmanresce.ca

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

Incorporate a more critical evaluation of the included studies' methodologies.
Provide a detailed description of the thematic analysis process.
Offer a nuanced discussion of conflicting findings in the literature.
Include concrete examples of successful interventions and their implementation challenges.
Clearly identify specific gaps in the literature and recommend methodological approaches for future research.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The article is well-structured, making it accessible to readers. Minor revisions for clarity, particularly in the methods and materials section, could further enhance readability.

Ensuring consistency in the use of key terms related to academic buoyancy throughout the review would improve its cohesiveness.

While the review includes a range of literature, updating it to incorporate the most recent studies on academic buoyancy could ensure its relevance.

The discussion section would benefit from a more explicit acknowledgment of the limitations inherent in narrative reviews, such as potential biases in article selection and interpretation.

Expanding the section on practical implications to offer more detailed guidance for educators and policymakers would make the review more useful for applying its findings in educational settings.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.