

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_108523
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF THE SUITABILITY OF POTENTIAL REGIONAL LEADING SECTORS AND EXPERTISE COMPETENCIES OF VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOLS IN BOALEMO DISTRICT
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes. This paper "Analysis of the suitability of potential regional leading sectors and expertise competencies of vocational high schools in Boalemo district" majorly focused on the determination of the suitability of SMK expertise fields with the potential of the regional superior sector. 2. Yes. 3. Yes. But needs revision. 4. No. Need revision. 5. No. Need revision. 6. No. Need to add some more references. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Need to improve the English in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The authors are required to address the following comments to improve the quality of the paper.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Beginning of the Abstract should discuss the importance of the topic. Revise the Abstract by following the guidelines such as topic importance, challenges, proposed methods, and results. Also, focus on improving English while revision. 2. The references in the manuscript are not enough. It is suggested to add some more references from recent years (preferably 2023). In general, in a conference paper, 15 to 20 references, and in a journal paper 25 or more references will be included. You can find the publications related to your research work and increase number of the references in the manuscript. 3. It is noticed that the section numbers are missing. Verify all identifiers of the tables and figures in the manuscript and include them wherever required. Authors should strictly follow the template guidelines. 4. Research method and contribution of the work need revision. Elaborate the methodology and clearly explain the contribution of the work. 5. Abbreviations need to be defined on their first usage. Verify and revise the abbreviations in the manuscript. E.g., SMK, SMA 6. Authors mentioned that the data are gathered by conducting the interviews. When did these interviews were conducted? How old is the data used for the proposed work? 7. In the manuscript, no visualizations were observed. How the reader can easily grasp and understand the proposed work without using any infographics. It is suggested to verify the possibility of adding graphs/charts wherever possible. Accordingly, revise the description of the results. 8. What are the limitations of the proposed work? Incorporate them in the manuscript. What is the future scope of this work? 	

Review Form 1.7

	9. Is the proposed work suitable for any other applications? Justify. 10. Revise the conclusions section by adding limitations and future scope. 11. It is recommended to proofread the paper before submission. Overall, the MAJOR changes are required in the manuscript. It needs some more revisions to reach the quality of the journal.	
--	--	--

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:	Purna Prakash Kasaraneni
Department, University & Country	Koneru Lakshmaiah Education Foundation, India