

OPINION A

How to reference this paper:

Jabbarov, R., Orujova, S., Nasibova, U., Aliyeva, L., & Verdiyeva, A. (2026). The impact of emotional exhaustion, stress, and aggression on academic achievement in university students. *Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional*, 30(esp1), e026017. <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v30iesp1.20906>



| **Submitted:** 05/01/2026
| **Revisions required:** 15/01/2026
| **Approved:** 20/02/2026
| **Published:** 30/03/2026

Editor: Prof. Dr. Sebastião de Souza Lemes
Deputy Executive Editor: Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

REVIEW FORM

Article title: The impact of emotional exhaustion, stress and aggression on academic achievement in university students

A. COGNITIVE DIMENSION
Sequential and logical sequencing of the content of scientific ideas.
1. Does the article contain original ideas that have not yet been presented on the subject?
☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No
2. Is the topic important to the context in which it is inserted?
☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No
3. Does the introduction make the research topic clear, present the studies that have addressed the problem or similar research and point out the gap that the research covers/justification for the research?
☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No
4. Does the introduction make it clear what the research question is or the hypotheses (if applicable) and are the general and/or specific objectives in line with the research question?
☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No
5. Is the theoretical framework relevant to the topic and in line with the objectives set?
☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No
6. Is the theoretical framework presented in sufficient quantity and quality for the research construct and are the ideas presented in sufficient depth for the study in question?
☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No
7. Does the theoretical framework presented include classic authors in the field who are still relevant to the discussion, and does it also include work from the last five years?
☐ Yes ☒ Partially ☐ No
8. Are the results consistent with the aim of the research, the theoretical framework and the methodology?

☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No
9. Is the data calculated correctly and do the results show that there is no fabrication or falsification of data?
☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No
10. Do the discussions correlate coherently with the theoretical framework?
☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No
11. Do the discussions correlate coherently with the results presented?
☐ Yes ☒ Partially ☐ No
12. Do the conclusions provide an answer to the research question and objectives?
☐ Yes ☒ Partially ☐ No
13. Do the conclusions present authorial closure without repeating previous parts of the article and pointing out the limitations of the research itself and future research?
☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☒ No
Reviewer's comments on the cognitive dimension.
-
B. METHODOLOGICAL DIMENSION
Precise description of the methods and techniques used.
1. Does the title specify the content of the work more generally and the subtitle (if there is one) is a technical title more related to the topic? Another possible approach is when the title refers to the theoretical object and the subtitle to the empirical object.
☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No
2. Does the abstract present the objective, methodology, results and conclusions in a way that is coherent with the work?
☐ Yes ☒ Partially ☐ No
3. Is the choice of keywords in line with the content of the article and the field?
☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No
4. Is the objective clearly written?
☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No

5. Is the methodology detailed, characterized and does it explain how data will be collected (if applicable) and analyzed?
☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No
6. Is the methodology coherent with the theory and consistent with the results?
☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No
7. If the research involves human beings, have the procedures carried out to comply with research ethics guidelines been described or the approval number of the work by the research ethics committee indicated?
☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No
Reviewer's comments on the methodological dimension.
-
C. AESTHETIC DIMENSION
Writing, form and normalization.
1. Are the rules observed with regard to citations (ABNT 10520 - 2023), references (ABNT 6023 - 2018), presentation of illustrations and tables (title and source)?
☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☒ No
2. Does the text show correct accentuation and typing of words; nominal and verbal agreement; correct arrangement of words and connection between sentences or paragraphs (cohesion); logical relationship of the ideas presented (coherence); avoid repetition in the text of what is already written in the illustrations and tables?
☐ Yes ☒ Partially ☐ No
3. Are the illustrations (graphs, charts, images, figures, maps) and tables of adequate size and legibility for reading?
☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☒ No
Reviewer's comments on the aesthetic dimension
-
Recommendation
☐ Accept ☒ Accept with mandatory corrections ☐ Submit again for evaluation

☐ Submit to another journal

☐ Reject

The reviews will be published without the identity of the reviewer, in accordance with the principles of Open Science. The reviewer must state whether he/she authorizes the publication of the review with his/her identity or authorizes it without his/her identity.

Once the reviewer agrees to the review, the review will be published without their identity. If the reviewer wishes to authorize their identification, please inform it in response to the review request.

Reviewer's opinion/ Comments

- The article addresses a very interesting and highly relevant topic that is certainly very pertinent to the educational environment, especially when considering university education. However, the way it was presented makes it seem more like a psychology study set in a university than a study on educational issues per se, as there is no specific proposition that considers the academic environment, and even the literature used is more focused on environments in general and specific issues than on the academic environment itself. Still, I do not believe that it is completely outside the scope of the journal, but I think it would be more appropriate for a journal that has a greater focus on psychological issues (such as DOXA, which works with psychology and education). That said, the work may also require some adjustments:

- The tables are confusing and difficult to read and interpret, which makes it hard to understand the analyses presented. The presentation of the tables needs to be corrected

- The abstract needs to be reduced to 150 words, considering that it should contain the presentation of the topic, theoretical framework, methodology used, overview of discussions/results, and a brief presentation of the conclusions of the study. I suggest avoiding specific statistical issues in the abstract and focusing only on presenting the study.

- The analyses end up being somewhat superficial because there is no section of the text dedicated to a more interpretative analysis of the data in light of the bibliography presented. It would be interesting to see greater authorial participation in the analysis and interpretation of the data, rather than just presenting the correlations observed in each table

- The final considerations, even though they provide the proposed answer, do not present an authorial conclusion. The authors are absent, and there is no wrap-up of the work, clearly showing what has been concluded, possibilities for working with this, and even for expanding the research (since limitations were pointed out during the work). The authors' voice is missing in this section.

Nevertheless, I reiterate that the work appears to be of great value and quality for the field, but in its current form, I believe it will need to be reviewed again. Also, as mentioned earlier, I suggest a journal/field that I believe is even more consistent with what was proposed in the text.

I reiterate that the sole purpose of this opinion is to contribute in the best possible way to the work being done here.

List of mandatory corrections

- Rewrite the abstract
- Redo the tables to make them clear
- Expand analyses with authorial excerpts beyond the direct and statistical interpretation of data presented
- Include the authors' words in the final considerations, concluding the work and expressing their views on what has been studied.

Publication of the opinion, according to Open Science standards

- ☒ I authorize publication without the name of the reviewer
- ☒ I authorize publication with the name of the reviewer
- ☒ I authorize publication with the name of the reviewer, being aware that the journals of Editora Ibero-Americana, it is mandatory to.

Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação
Review, formatting, standardization, and Translation

