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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 presents the first multilingual systematic review of Daisaku Ikeda’s educational philosophy, with a focus on "Ningen kyōiku" (Human Education). Given Ikeda’s significant yet underexplored contributions to holistic and humanistic education, this study fills an essential gap by synthesizing research across linguistic and cultural contexts. It elevates the global relevance of Ikeda's philosophy, especially in addressing educational crises such as inequality, environmental degradation, and ethical leadership. The work is highly valuable for scholars in comparative education, philosophy of education, global citizenship, and sustainability education. | Thank you. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | Yes, the title is accurate, specific, and appropriately reflects the content of the paper. It clearly indicates both the subject matter (Ikeda’s "Ningen kyōiku") and the methodology (systematic multilingual review). | Thank you. |
| 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 clearly defines the scope methodology (PRISMA), and results. It equally highlights the novelty of the study and its relevance as well as mentioning the languages and the number of studies reviewed.  However, it could benefit from considering the term “HE” on the first use (Human Education) before using the acronym. Again, “quantitative” should be replaced with “empirical” for better accuracy, as the review notes the lack of empirical studies more than statistical analyses. For instance, it could read this way "...advocates for further empirical research to complement the existing theoretical scholarship..." | Done. Thank you. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | Yes, the manuscript is scientifically sound:   * Uses appropriate methodology (PRISMA-A and qualitative meta-synthesis). * Demonstrates rigorous multilingual data collection and thematic analysis. * Provides accurate interpretations and limitations.   However, the section discussing data analysis via Python (3.6) and visualization tools could benefit from more concise clarification, i.e., separating technical tools from interpretive insights. | Thank you. I changed the Python topic. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | Yes, the references are:   * Extensive and recent (most from the past 5–10 years). * Well-balanced across English, Chinese, Japanese, and other multilingual sources. * Include foundational and cutting-edge works.   Suggested additional references:  An empirical study applying Ikeda’s philosophy in a Western classroom could enrich the practical implications. | Thank you. I agree. |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Generallygood, but a few improvements could enhance readability:   * Some long, complex sentences would benefit from simplification. * Minor grammatical errors (e.g., subject-verb agreement, article use) need editing.   Examples**:**   * “This paper is the first systematic review to assess Daisaku Ikeda...” → "This paper presents the first systematic review of..." * “The review does suggest...” → “The review suggests...” | Done |
| Optional/General comments | This is a robust and significant scholarly contribution. The work is:   * Original and methodologically rigorous. * Interdisciplinary, with implications for educational theory, ethics, environmental education, and cultural studies. * Strongly positioned to become a foundational reference for Ikeda Studies and value-creating education.   It also exemplifies best practices in multilingual scholarship and inclusive research.   * Structure: Well-organized, logically progressing from theoretical grounding to methodology, analysis, and implications. * Keywords: Could benefit from adding "value-creating education" or "Soka education" for better indexing. * Exceptional originality and relevance. * Thorough literature review and methodology. * Some minor issues with grammar and phrasing that can be corrected before publication. | Thank you for the wise comments |
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| **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)* | NA |