

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_130949
Title of the Manuscript:	King Abdelaziz University Preparatory Year Engineering Students’ Reluctance to Enroll in Nuclear Engineering: Reasons and Possible Solutions
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The importance of this paper to the scientific community lies in its in-depth exploration of the reasons behind the hesitation of preparatory year engineering students at King Abdulaziz University in Saudi Arabia to choose nuclear engineering as a major. This research is crucial for understanding students' perceptions of nuclear energy and its acceptance within the education system, especially in countries like Saudi Arabia that are undergoing a key energy transition. As the country's demand for nuclear energy grows, ensuring that there will be enough skilled professionals to support nuclear projects in the future is critical. This study helps develop effective strategies to promote nuclear engineering education and attract more students to the field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear and appropriate.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract summarizes the research goals and findings, but it would be helpful if it briefly mentioned the methodology to enhance its comprehensiveness.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct, and the research design is suitable for the research questions. The data analysis methods also seem robust. However, some interpretations of the results could be further strengthened, particularly by discussing potential biases in the responses or providing more details in the limitations section.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references appear sufficient, but adding more literature on similar studies in other countries or regions would be beneficial. Specifically, studies on students' hesitations regarding nuclear energy education would help in understanding their attitudes.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is generally good, but some sentence structures and wording can be improved for clearer expression.	
Optional/General comments	The abstract summarizes the research goals and findings well, but it would be more comprehensive if the methodology was briefly mentioned.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Huang Yan-Ping
Department, University & Country	Minghsin University of Science and Technology, Taiwan