Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JESBS_88484**
Title of the Manuscript:	**PREDICTIVE ABILITY OF ADVERSITY QUOTIENT, EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, AND PERSONALITY ON ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN PSYCHOLOGY STUDENTS**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(https://www.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-policy)

Review Form 1.6

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**Your title would be clearer and catchier if you edited it: PREDICTIVE ABILITY OF NONCOGNITIVE FACTORS ON ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF UNDERGRADUATE PSYCHOLOGY STUDENTS.**	Title has been changed
	Generally, very happy. Well executed, well organized, and consistent.	Revision amended
	MUST have a limitations section. All good research has limitations. **Eliminate Table 1 because you provide all the information in the reading; it adds nothing new to the article.**	Correction amended
	You must state which program you used to conduct the statistical analysis. **It is normal to hide the location of the analysis to anonymize it and place it in context with other settings to improve generalizability. Suggestion is to state the kind of university and give a description of the context.**	Done revision
	Table 3.1/3.2/3.3 show sometimes you used t test and other times Mann-Whitney. Address why/justify. Add this to methodology section.	Noted and made revision
	Tables 4.1/4.2/4.3 show you used Spearman's correlation. Please clearly state this in the methodology section and address why/justify. Did you examine scattergrams as well?	Corrected
	Good writing requires you formally introduce the table before showing the table. **Each paragraph before each table should say the table by name and the purpose. Good writing, as you have, also talk about it afterwards.** **You have 32 statistical tests and find 1 significant. This is a significant limitation: With so many subgroup analyses, one is bound to find a significance somewhere. Still, what does this significance mean *practically?*** **When discussing probability in the reading, there should not be a leading zero (correct: $p = .05$; incorrect: $p = 0.05$).** **Notice Table 3.3's findings on emotional stability contradicts, in part, your findings in Table 4.3 and Table 5. You need to address the low reliability!** **I would clean up the conclusion section: You pin everything on one significant test. Contextually, there is more unknowns and little value in your own statistically significant finding. It is acceptable to have null findings!**	Done
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	