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| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (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.** | **The manuscript provides a timely solution in mechanical engineering education by offering solid approaches to fill the chasm between classroom learning and what is required by industry in China. The model under consideration helps construct professional skills, engineering methods and digital knowledge necessary for mechanical engineers today and in the future. The authors help engineering educators by uncovering problems with present teaching approaches and proposing specific changes that can meet the needs of smart manufacturing. The paper’s focus on new ideas and industry-university partnerships helps it apply to many institutions worldwide that are trying to prepare engineers for tough manufacturing issues.** | We sincerely appreciate your insightful feedback on our manuscript. Your recognition of its potential to bridge the gap between academic training and industrial demands in mechanical engineering is particularly encouraging. We are grateful for your emphasis on the model’s applicability to global institutions addressing smart manufacturing challenges. Your thoughtful commentary reinforces the value of industry-university collaboration, and we will further refine the paper with these perspectives in mind. Thank you for your valuable perspective. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **This manuscript is well-summarized by the title "Reconstruction of the Cultivation Model for Mechanical Professional Degree Postgraduates Oriented Toward a Manufacturing Powerhouse." It effectively highlights the main aim of the paper: transforming postgraduates' educational system for mechanical engineering to match China's manufacturing objectives. The name shows how the research supports reforms and is aligned with industrial policies set by the country. The idea behind reconstruction is that it will bring important changes, not simple adjustments, to the current system of education. The title, on the whole, is suitable for the manuscript because it indicates what the manuscript is all about without any needed changes.** | We sincerely appreciate your thoughtful analysis of our manuscript title. Your recognition of how effectively it captures the paper's core mission—transforming mechanical engineering education to align with China's manufacturing ambitions—is particularly valuable. We are grateful for your observation that the term 'reconstruction' conveys substantial systemic reform rather than incremental adjustments. Your endorsement of the title's clarity and appropriateness provides us with great confidence in our chosen framing. Thank you for this insightful and affirming feedback. |
| 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 A quick reference to how the proposed model was put together would increase the scientific accuracy of the abstract.**  **2 You should describe in the abstract the Five Competencies mentioned in the paper’s model because they are significant but not mentioned in the current abstract.** | We sincerely appreciate your constructive suggestions for improving our abstract. Your first point about briefly outlining the model's development process is well noted - we will add this methodological detail to enhance scientific rigor. Regarding your second observation, we fully agree that the 'Five Competencies' framework deserves explicit mention in the abstract given its centrality to our proposed model. We will revise accordingly to ensure these key elements are properly highlighted. Thank you for these valuable recommendations that will significantly strengthen our paper's presentation. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | **1 Through its structured analysis, the manuscript shows that the study of mechanical engineering postgraduate education in China is scientifically sound. The writers explain their work in relation to the national strategic context and show why key problems exist in the current education system. The new approach proposed by the Commission was developed to deal with the challenges mentioned above.**  **2 While the paper is well argued, I think more supporting data in the form of numbers could help demonstrate the effectiveness of the recommended model. Partnerships like those from Tsinghua and CASIC and Zhejiang with Geely, strengthen the science side of things, but more actual data would prove their claims.**  **3 All references provided are current and 2025 works included suggest that the latest research was used while preparing the manuscript. To move from understanding the question to developing an answer, the model uses a respected scientific methodology, though a better description of the development of the model would strengthen the scientific validity.** | Thank you for your thorough and constructive review of our manuscript. We sincerely appreciate your recognition of our structured analysis aligning with China's national strategy (Point 1). Regarding your valuable suggestions: we will (1) enhance quantitative data support, particularly from our industry partnerships (Tsinghua-CASIC, Zhejiang-Geely etc.) as noted in Point 2; and (2) provide more detailed methodological description of model development to strengthen scientific validity per Point 3. We agree these improvements will make our arguments more robust. Your expertise has been invaluable in elevating the quality of our work. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | **The references are adequate and feature articles dated 2023 through 2025, showing that the latest literature is used in this paper. Because this review includes a mix of local and global literature, it is well suited to reviewing this topic.** | Thank you for your positive feedback regarding our reference selection. We greatly appreciate your recognition of our efforts to incorporate both recent (2023-2025) and geographically diverse literature. This balanced approach was indeed intentional to ensure comprehensive coverage of both local context and global perspectives in mechanical engineering education reform. Your validation of our literature review methodology is particularly encouraging as we strive to maintain academic rigor while addressing China's specific educational needs within the international landscape. |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | **There is a need for the author to significantly improve the language quality of the article to make it fit for scholarly communications. Even though the manuscript contains useful information, its language in English often makes it too difficult to understand. Sometimes, sentences contain too many unnatural words and may be constructed like sentences in a different language. The chapter uses precise technical terms, yet the explanations that follow are difficult to follow clearly. If you want to improve your paper’s clarity without removing vital technical content, work with someone who is skilled in engineering and academic English. It would make it much easier for researchers from other countries to use the manuscript.** | 1. The linguistic quality of the article has been comprehensively optimized as recommended. Complex sentence structures have been reorganized, unnatural expressions adjusted, and professional terminology applied accurately to ensure readability.  2. Opaque sentences in the article have been split, restructured, and redundant wording simplified, significantly enhancing readability while preserving core content. |
| Optional/General comments | **It is helpful to question practical examples (similar to the Tsinghua-CASIC and Zhejiang-Geely partnerships) to build credibility, however, they would profit from further exploration of the results and experiences gained. All in all, after some refinements and with better writing, this work could have a strong impact on engineering education reform literature.**  **Some significant but possible alterations, the manuscript could become a useful resource for literature on engineering education changes in manufacturing.** | We sincerely appreciate your constructive feedback regarding our case study analysis. We fully agree that deeper exploration of the Tsinghua-CASIC and Zhejiang-Geely partnership outcomes would significantly enhance the practical value of our research. Your suggestion to elaborate on the concrete results and experiential insights from these collaborations is particularly valuable - we will strengthen this dimension in our revision. We are encouraged by your assessment that with these refinements, the manuscript could make meaningful contributions to engineering education reform literature. Your expertise in identifying these impactful yet achievable improvements is greatly appreciated. |
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|  | Reviewer’s comment | **Author’s Feedback** (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 detail)*  No. The paper demonstrates that the educational policy and curriculum meet standard academic practices and do not raise any noticeable ethical issues. | No. |