

Article history: Received 25 December 2023 Revised 26 February 2024 Accepted 07 March 2024 Published online 10 March 2024

Journal of Adolescent and Youth Psychological Studies

Open peer-review report



E-ISSN: 2981-2526

Effectiveness of a Gratitude Journal Intervention on Well-Being and Academic Achievement

Dimitra. Kalogeropoulos 10, Eleni. Papadopoulos 2*0

¹ Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Crete, Rethymno, Greece
² Department of Health Psychology, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

* Corresponding author email address: epapadopoulos@psych.uoa.gr

Editor	Reviewers
Gholamreza Rajabi®	Reviewer 1: Karim Afshariniya [©]
Professor of Counseling	Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad
Department, Shahid Chamran University, Ahvaz, Iran rajabireza@scu.ac.ir	University, Kermanshah, Iran Email: k.afsharineya@iauksh.ac.ir
	Reviewer 2: Keivan Kakabraee (b)
	Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad
	University, Kermanshah, Iran. Email: keivan@iauksh.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The claim that "Gratitude journaling has been extensively evaluated as a low-cost, scalable intervention..." requires more precision. It would strengthen the paragraph to mention how many trials or meta-analyses support this claim.

In discussing "Gratitude and Academic Life," the authors mention promoting "positive academic identity." This is an important psychological construct—please define it more precisely and cite literature to support its inclusion in the session.

While assumptions for repeated measures ANOVA are addressed, the authors do not report effect sizes beyond partial η^2 . It would be helpful to interpret these effect sizes based on standard benchmarks to understand their practical significance.

The statement "...participants from various universities in Greece..." is too vague. Please specify the number of universities involved or provide a broader description of the institutional context.

The paragraph describing Table 1 should interpret the magnitude of the GPA increase. While statistically significant, is a change from 2.89 to 3.18 considered educationally meaningful? Clarifying this would aid readers' interpretation.

The Shapiro-Wilk test is used for normality, but the sample size is quite small (n = 30). Please acknowledge the limited power of normality tests in small samples and consider complementing them with visual assessments.

The reference to participants continuing their journaling practice is anecdotal. Was this formally assessed? If not, it should be stated that this was based on informal participant feedback.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The sentence "...more controlled trials that examine their long-term effects..." could be expanded to define what constitutes "long-term" in this context and whether five months (as done in the current study) qualifies as such.

The authors note that "30 participants were recruited..." without explaining how randomization was carried out (e.g., block randomization, computer-generated sequences). Please clarify this for methodological transparency.

The description of sessions is highly informative, but the manuscript lacks a rationale for selecting ten sessions over five weeks. Was this based on prior evidence or logistical constraints?

The term "Error" in the ANOVA table may be misinterpreted. Please clarify whether this refers to within-subject error or total error variance to help readers interpret the model.

The statement "These findings suggest that cultivating gratitude..." should be revised to include a cautionary tone due to the small sample size, e.g., "These findings tentatively suggest..."

The sentence "...participants in the experimental group reported improvements in GPA..." could benefit from a discussion on whether these improvements could be partially due to placebo effects or increased attention in the intervention group.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

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

