





Predicting Resilience Based on Spiritual Health and Psychological Well-Being Among University Students




Heshmat Allah. Eskandari Asl^{1*}, Froozan. Dolatyari², Hamed. Alipor³, Abdolmajid. Mohammadi¹

¹ Assistant professor, Department of Public Administration, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran.

² Instructor, Department of Management, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran.

³ Instructor, Department of Public Administration, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran.

* Corresponding author email address: dr.h.eskandari1353@pnu.ac.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Trevor Archer  Professor Department of Psychology University of Gothenburg Sweden trevorcsarcher49@gmail.com	Reviewer 1: Mohammad Masoud Dayarian  Assistant Professor, Department of Counseling, Khomeinishahr Branch, Islamic Azad University.Komeinishar/Isfahan,Iran. dayariyan@iaukhsh.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Ali Khodaei  Department of Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Payam Noor University, Tehran, Iran. Email: alikhodaei@pnu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

While discussed in the limitations, the small sample size and its implications for statistical power and generalizability should also be noted in the Methods and Materials section for transparency.

This intervention section seems unrelated to the main study's design and hypotheses. If CBT was not part of the study's data collection or variable set, this entire section should be removed or clarified regarding its relevance.

Given the small N=43 and use of convenience sampling, the term "all students" is misleading. It would be more accurate to describe the sample as "a subset of students."

Given the multidimensional nature of the predictors (spiritual health, psychological well-being) and the outcome (resilience), consider including a conceptual framework figure in the introduction or methods section to clarify hypothesized relationships.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Please justify why convenience sampling was appropriate for the study's aim, and discuss its inherent limitations regarding external validity in the Study Design and Participants subsection.

The process by which content validity was evaluated (e.g., expert panel, CVR, CVI) should be detailed, especially since localization of international tools can influence validity.

In the Measures section, some instruments report multiple alpha values and some only one. Please consistently report reliability indices for each subscale and the total score.

This paragraph would benefit from being presented in a table for improved clarity and visual accessibility.

This sentence is misplaced and inaccurate, as the study does not address sleep quality. It appears to be a leftover from a different manuscript and should be deleted.

It is unclear whether this figure refers to the standardized β or R. For proper APA format, specify the coefficient type and include t-values and confidence intervals where possible.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.