



<b>Manuscript Title:</b>	Social Life-Style Attributes and Academic Performance among Students
<b>Type of Article:</b>	Original Article

### **FIRST ROUND**

#### **Editor**

##### **General Comments and Recommendations**

The reviewers recognize the potential of the manuscript and suggest revisions to improve its clarity, depth, and overall quality. The authors are encouraged to carefully address all reviewer feedback in the revised version.

#### **Reviewer 1**

##### **General Comments and Recommendations**

The paper is relevant and the topic is practical for school setting, but the main concern for me is the construct and interpretation of the main variable, social lifestyle attributes. In the present version, this variable is too broad and mixed. It combines peer relations, time management, study habits, technology use, and extracurricular involvement into one score, then relates that single score to academic performance. Because of this, the meaning of the significant correlation becomes unclear. The paper has potential, but the central variable needs better conceptual and analytical grounding before the conclusions can become strong and convincing.

##### **Specific Comments and Recommendations**

The authors need to clarify first what exactly is meant by social lifestyle attributes. Some indicators are clearly social in nature, like peer interaction and collaboration, but others are more on self-regulation or study behavior, such as time management, study schedule, and hours of study. Technology use for academic purposes is also another dimension. These are not necessarily one construct. When all are merged into one overall mean, it becomes difficult to know what really explains the relationship with academic performance. In the same way, the conclusion that school acts as a social equalizer feels too strong because the data only show no significant difference across some demographic groups, not direct evidence of equalizing mechanism. I suggest the authors revise the framework and align the discussion strictly with



what the data can support. It may help if they reorganize the variable into clearer dimensions or explain strongly why these indicators belong to one construct only. Without this, the significant but very low correlation may be overinterpreted, and the paper's main contribution becomes less clear.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accept the manuscript for publication.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

### Reviewer 2

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The study tackles a very timely issue, especially considering how the pandemic has shifted the digital and social habits of our students. The paper is generally organized and easy to follow.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
Kindly check the consistency of your instrument's reliability results. In the Abstract, it is stated that the researcher-developed instrument has an alpha of 0.76. However, in the Methods section, it is mentioned that the pilot test yielded a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.80. Please clarify which value is the correct one.
There is a mathematical error in your interpretation of the coefficient of determination. The manuscript states that $r^2 = 0.019$ , which indicates that only 1.19 percent of the variation of the academic performance can be explained. If $r^2 = 0.019$ , the percentage should be 1.9%, not 1.19%. Consequently, the unexplained variance should be corrected from 98.81 percent to 98.1 percent. Kindly recalculate and revise the text accordingly.
The correlation found between social lifestyle attributes and academic performance is $r = 0.139$ . While this is statistically significant at $p=0.046$ , it is a very weak positive correlation. Recommending a critical pedagogical shift based on a variable that explains less than 2% of the variance in grades is an overstretch. I suggest toning down the conclusions and recommendations so they realistically reflect the actual strength of the data.



Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

**SECOND ROUND**

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer 1</u>	<u>Reviewer 2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			