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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 paper underscores the benefits of the program against the backdrop of the benefits of globalisation in the wake of competitive job markets across the world. Acquiring global competence is necessary for preparing graduates to enter the job market. I would encourage more study abroad programs to universities especially in the less developed countries.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title of the article is quite appropriate. The meaning of key words and phrases in the title, that is, ‘preventing a boondoggle’, ‘research abroad’ and ‘educative experience’ comes out clearly in the body of the paper. The benefits of research abroad program as argued in the article justifies the use of the phrase ‘preventing a boondoggle’.** |  |
| 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 of the article is comprehensive as it covers all sections of a research paper. However, a few areas may need redress. (i) Eliminate sub-headings in the abstract-write in one paragraph. (ii) Include educative experience in the list of key words. (iii) State the aim of the paper clearly rather than noting that ‘the paper discusses this issue’. The paragraph preceding methodology section on page 137 brings it out. (iv) Findings are not specific. What is substantive educative experience? The indicators are in the findings of the article. (v) Document analysis is a method of data collection in my view. Also mention the other method used in the study.** |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | **Subsections and the structure of the manuscript are appropriate save for two areas: (i)Move the eight principles of good practice to methodology section while retain assurance of the principle in the findings section. (ii) Provide samples of participants’ work that matches selected rubrics in Table II under the six SLOs. This would not only add credibility to the work but would also offer readers opportunity to interact with cross-cultural education experience. (ii) Include samples of students’ reflections based on the DEAL model.** |  |
| **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.** | **The background of the study is clearly explained highlighting benefits of research abroad program from past studies. Appropriate research design was chosen for the study. Procedures followed in the study have been articulated well leaving no doubt that the findings are authentic.** |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | **References are sufficient.** |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | **The article is excellent, with clear writing, excellent English, good organization and fluent presentation of work done and findings. Very minor errors are noted: i) Redundancy of the preposition ‘for’ in the 3rd last sentence under conclusion section (P. 145). (ii) Replace ‘product’ with ‘produce’ in the 3rd sentence of the conclusion section.** |  |
| Optional/General comments | **Explain acronyms, STEM, ROTC and ERAU. Since academic community is international and cross-cultural, acronyms could assume diverse meanings in different contexts.** |  |
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