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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.** | **This manuscript provides very interesting research about the entrepreneurial mindsets of Grade 12 ABM**  **students at a medical school.** | This manuscript contributes to the growing body of knowledge on youth entrepreneurship by exploring the entrepreneurial mindsets of Grade 12  ABM students in a medical school context. It provides insights into how young individuals develop entrepreneurial tendencies, especially in  environments not traditionally associated with business education. The study also offers a foundation for further research and curriculum development  aimed at fostering entrepreneurial thinking among senior high school  students. By focusing on a specific demographic, it helps bridge gaps in existing literature and offers implications for both academic institutions and policy-makers. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title of the article is suitable. The title meets the requirements of a research paper. It has ontological, epistemological and methodological discussion. Then it presents the results of the study. The only aspect that the article needs to improve is the ontological and epistemological discussion in the introduction.** | Thank you for affirming that the title is appropriate. We appreciate the suggestion to enhance the ontological and epistemological framing in the introduction. We will revise that section to better establish the foundation of  the research and clearly outline its philosophical underpinnings. |
| **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 is comprehensive. It follows the structured abstract format. It met the requirement in each component.** | Thank you for the feedback. We’re glad the abstract met the structural requirements. |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | The manuscript met the scientific requirement. It has ontological discussion to provide the research problem. It has the epistemological discussion to provide the review previous studies. Then, it provides the methodological discussion before presenting the results and discussion. | We appreciate the positive comments on the scientific soundness of the manuscript. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | References are sufficient and adequate. | Thank you. |
| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | The English language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication as shown in this manuscript. | Thank you for the positive assessment of the language quality. |
| **Optional/General** comments | **This manuscript is generally acceptable. However, it needs to improve the introduction section to show the research gap and the key literature review to support the hypotheses and propositions of the study.**  The manuscript does not provide adequate research gap on the entrepreneurial mindsets. The manuscript should provide discussion on how the entrepreneurial mindsets have been measured and tested quantitatively in the previous studies. Then how could this study measured differently in terms of quantitative. Then how the measure qualitatively. The results in the study mainly showed the survey results. As the study mentioned as explanatory sequential of mixed methods, after the survey results, the FGD must explain the survey results. | Thank you for your overall recommendation. |
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| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* | There are no ethical issues in this manuscript. All participants were informed about the purpose of the study, and informed consent was obtained prior to their participation. The research was conducted in accordance with ethical guidelines for studies involving human subjects. |