

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_99006
Title of the Manuscript:	LOCATION-BASED SMART AIRPORT MODEL IN RADAR COURSE INTRODUCTION
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>The manuscript is deemed important for the scientific community, particularly for aviation service users, as stated in the reviewer's comment. The study's relevance to the target audience adds value to the field by addressing a relevant and significant topic that could potentially benefit aviation service users.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The authors should consider expanding the abstract to include more details on the implications of the study's findings. It is important for the abstract to clearly state the implications of the research for the scientific community, industry, or policy makers, in order to provide a complete understanding of the significance of the study.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Firstly, the author should clearly state the aim of the study in the background of the study section. This would provide a clear context and rationale for the research, allowing readers to better understand the motivation and purpose of the study.</p> <p>Secondly, the manuscript under review presents interesting findings, but there are some areas that require further improvement. In particular, the findings section would benefit from a more comprehensive and detailed account of the results obtained from the data analysis. The authors should provide a clear and organized presentation of the findings, including descriptive findings that highlight key trends, patterns, or relationships observed in the data. This would enhance the understanding of the results and strengthen the validity of the study.</p> <p>Thirdly, the discussion section needs more elaboration by incorporating relevant past studies to support the findings of the current study. Providing evidence or examples from relevant studies would add depth and context to the discussion, and further support the conclusions drawn from the current study.</p> <p>Lastly, the conclusion section is insufficient and not comprehensive. The authors should highlight the practical implications of their findings and provide recommendations for future research or practical applications based on the study's results. This would add value to the manuscript and provide guidance for further research or real-world applications of the study's findings. A well-structured conclusion that summarizes the main findings, discusses their implications, and provides practical recommendations would strengthen the overall contribution of the manuscript.</p> <p>Acceptable</p>	
<p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Overall, the language and English quality of the article are understandable and acceptable to the readers. However, it is noted that the manuscript requires English editing for proofreading.</p> <p>There are several instances where minor language errors, such as grammar, syntax, and punctuation, are present throughout the manuscript. These errors may affect the clarity and readability of the article and may need to be addressed to ensure that the manuscript meets the standards of scholarly communications.</p> <p>I would recommend the authors to thoroughly revise and proofread the manuscript for English language errors to enhance the overall quality of the article. Additionally, the authors may consider seeking assistance from a professional English language editor to ensure that the manuscript is polished and error-free before submitting it for publication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wan Edura Wan Rashid
Department, University & Country	Institute of Business Excellence, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia