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|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **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.** | **I think the knowledge and contents provided can help the readers of this manuscript. However, the writing style as well as the way to introduce various key contents with overloaded acronyms can confuse the readers to get the key insights from the article. So, I think it is necessary for the author to rethink about this.** | I appreciate the reviewer’s feedback and their recognition of the manuscript’s value to the scientific community. The importance of this study has been clearly articulated in the introduction and discussion sections, but we have now further emphasized its significance by adding a concise summary in the introduction. Regarding the writing style and use of acronyms, we have ensured that all acronyms are introduced with their full forms and are commonly used within the field to maintain precision and conciseness. However, we have carefully reviewed the manuscript to further enhance clarity and readability while preserving its technical accuracy. We believe these refinements adequately address the reviewer’s concerns. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **Yes, it is appropriate one.** | Agree with the reviewer’s comment. |
| 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. | 1. **The abstract has captured the crux of the whole article (Objectives, findings and future research related). But please include the methodology of the study in the abstract section. It is missing there.** | I would like to clarify that the methodology is already concisely mentioned in the abstract to maintain brevity and readability, as per journal guidelines. Nonetheless, we have carefully reviewed the abstract and made slight refinements to further emphasize the methodological approach without compromising its conciseness. We hope this addresses the reviewer’s concern. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | **There are many problems in the writing style as we are in the academic community. So, the author needs to learn about the ways of writing in the scholarly discourse.** | I appreciate the reviewer’s feedback; however, I respectfully disagree with the assessment regarding the writing style. The manuscript has been structured in accordance with standard academic conventions, ensuring clarity, coherence, and adherence to scholarly discourse. Moreover, we have carefully followed the journal’s guidelines for academic writing. Nevertheless, we have reviewed the manuscript once again to further refine the language and enhance readability, ensuring it meets the highest scholarly standards. We hope this revision addresses any concerns. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | **The references and some of the in-text citations are there in the article. However, it is necessary to learn about the referencing style- whether the journal is following the APA 7th edition or not. Try to check it in detail.** | I appreciate the reviewer’s feedback. I have carefully followed the journal’s prescribed referencing style and ensured consistency throughout the manuscript. The references and in-text citations adhere to the required format. However, we have thoroughly rechecked them to confirm compliance with the journal’s guidelines. If there are specific concerns, we would appreciate further clarification. |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | **Somewhat. The author needs to go thorough reading and revising the whole draft by addressing the comments provided in the main manuscript.** | I appreciate the reviewer’s feedback and their effort in evaluating my manuscript. I have carefully reviewed the entire draft and thoroughly addressed all comments provided in the main manuscript. Revisions have been made where necessary to enhance clarity, coherence, and overall readability. We believe these improvements have strengthened the manuscript and hope it now meets the reviewer’s expectations. |
| Optional/General comments | 1. **Try to set the context of the study along with referencing the ideas from prominent scholars.** 2. **The data analysis process is missing in the article. The author needs to detail the process of data collection techniques and procedures.** 3. **In-text citation is lacking in all the parts of the Major Findings Section. Please read and know how to write the findings and discussion part seriously.** 4. **The referencing style should be taken seriously to give credit to all authors whose ideas are quoted in the whole manuscript.** 5. **This manuscript needs serious editing and revising by the author to bring it into the publication phase. Please take the in-text comments (which are in track change mode)in the documents seriously to improve the overall manuscript.** | I appreciate the reviewer’s time and effort in evaluating the manuscript. However, I would like to clarify a few points regarding the comments provided:  1. **Context and Referencing:** The introduction already sets the study’s context, supported by references to key scholars in the field. Nevertheless, we have reviewed and refined this section to further enhance clarity and relevance.  2. **Data Analysis Process:** The manuscript explicitly details the data collection techniques and analytical procedures in the methodology section. We have revisited this part to ensure it is comprehensive and clearly articulated.  3. **In-text Citations in Major Findings:** The major findings section primarily presents original results rather than discussing prior research. However, where relevant, we have ensured appropriate citations to strengthen the discussion.  4. **Referencing Style:** The manuscript adheres to the required referencing style. However, we have conducted a thorough review to ensure consistency and proper attribution throughout.  5. **Editing and Revisions:** While we have taken great care in refining the manuscript, we appreciate the reviewer’s input and have carefully addressed the in-text comments where applicable to further enhance readability and coherence.  I hope these clarifications and revisions address the reviewer’s concerns and improve the manuscript’s quality. |
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