

OPINION A

How to reference this paper:

Jabbarov, R., Guliyev, C., Nazrin, A., Hajiyeva, S., & Bayaramova, S. (2026). Psychological issues of the impact of students' mental state on the effectiveness of their learning activities. *Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional*, 30(esp1), e026032. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v30iesp1.20942>



| Submitted: 05/01/2026
| Revisions required: 15/01/2026
| Approved: 28/02/2026
| Published: 30/03/2026

Editor: Prof. Dr. Sebastião de Souza Lemes

Deputy Executive Editor: Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

REVIEW FORM

Article title: Psychological issues of the impact of students mental state on the effectiveness of their learning activities

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?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Is the topic important to the context in which it is inserted?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> 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?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> 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?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Is the theoretical framework relevant to the topic and in line with the objectives set?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> 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?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> 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?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
8. Are the results consistent with the aim of the research, the theoretical framework and the methodology?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
9. Is the data calculated correctly and do the results show that there is no fabrication or falsification of data?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
10. Do the discussions correlate coherently with the theoretical framework?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
11. Do the discussions correlate coherently with the results presented?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
12. Do the conclusions provide an answer to the research question and objectives?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> 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?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> 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.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Does the abstract present the objective, methodology, results and conclusions in a way that is coherent with the work?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Is the choice of keywords in line with the content of the article and the field?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Is the objective clearly written?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> 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 paper presents a relevant and timely topic, bringing several factors into the analysis and providing an overview of the possible influence of students' mental state on academic results.

- I believe that although the study is well done, the text needs to be revised, as the way it is written and some spelling problems make it very difficult to read and understand some parts.

- In the data analysis, there seems to be some confusion with the numbering of tables in the writing and analyses. Data from Table 5 is being analyzed as if it were from Table 4, and Table 4 itself has not been analyzed in text format. It is important to include this in the writing.

- The organization of data in the tables could also be improved. In some tables, it is somewhat difficult to identify the exact position of the data in relation to the rows.

That said, the work is suitable for publication after the changes listed below have been made.

It is reiterated that the sole purpose of this opinion is to contribute in the best possible way to the work.

List of mandatory corrections

- Reduce the number of keywords to a maximum of 5

- The abstract must be limited to 150 words and contain the following elements: presentation of the topic addressed, theoretical framework, methodology used, brief presentation of discussions/analyses, and brief presentation of conclusions.

- The analyses in Table 4 need to be revised, as there is data from Table 5 being referred to as Table 4, and Table 4 does not have a subsequent analysis in the text.

- The text needs a detailed review; there are many passages that are difficult to understand and some where the writing is quite confusing.

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

