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| PART 1: Review Comments | | |
| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer’s comment | 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | The purpose of this study was to investigate how meaningful study abroad experiences are attained based on duration; however, the study also found that students were able to effectively complete SLOs in short-term, structured study abroad programs that are not credit bearing. Because students can be asked to create a document, like a poster or manuscript, that can then be displayed on a graduate resume that illustrates a unique co-curricular learning experience, the findings confirm that such programs, even though they are non-credit experiences, can provide a unique contribution to college outcomes. Offering short-term study abroad options as an alternative to semester- or year-long experiences can help universities and colleges achieve research-based, program-agnostic SLO achievement, given the financial and curricular rigidity of some students. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | article title matches |  |
| 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 must be written very concisely and clearly, not just repeating what is in the Introduction, Methodology, Results and Conclusion. The author is too long in providing an introduction, so that the research results and interesting conclusions do not have enough space  It is necessary to review the literature on the topic under study to be able to assess the quality of the literature and the relevance of the article.  It is necessary to link these findings back to the literature review and what is already known. It is necessary to review whether there is a discussion about differences with previous findings? If a hypothesis is identified, is it supported? Have the strengths and limitations of the study including generalizability been discussed? Have the initial aims of the research been adequately discussed?. In the discussion, we mostly discuss the results of Many references use regulations or laws and do not focus on the research results themselves. |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | The subsections and structure of the manuscript are in accordance with the surrounding style.  In the introduction, the research gap is not yet visible. There is no data for this explanation coming from the media or research results. The sentence should read "in this research. The abbreviation should be given first |  |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | Writing made with scientific principles. Based on the understanding of scientific work, it is understood that scientific work contains data, facts, and scientific innovations. This scientific work also has a reproductive nature, is not ambiguous, objective, not emotional, and uses standard language. Writing scientific work must pay attention to scientific principles, use research methods, be cohesive, and use effective sentences. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | There should be a reference to the latest year |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | In this scientific paper, the use of language (diction) is straightforward, avoids multiple interpretations, and adheres to the principles of scientific principles, contains scientific knowledge and truth which presents facts and is arranged systematically according to writing methods using scientific language. |  |
| Optional/General comments | The methodology must be written clearly, with nothing to hide. So that readers who are not too in-depth in this field can understand the technicalities of the research or even imitate the methodology used. The explanation of the methodology is not detailed enough. The methodology must be explained in the form of processes or work steps in clear sentences. |  |
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