

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_106671
Title of the Manuscript:	Map of actors, interpretation of the diagram elaborated and sequencing of their actions
Type of the 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.journalcjust.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community because it presents an innovative case study approach to the development of decision-making competences in students.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is appropriate as it correctly reflects the focus and key findings of the study.</p> <p>3. In this article, keywords include "Map of actors, Creativity, Medicine Career", which do not accurately reflect the topic and content of the article.</p> <p>4. The structure and subsections of the article conform to the basic requirements of scientific research papers, with clear expression and strong logic, which is conducive to readers quickly understanding the main content of the article. Therefore, the structure and subsections of this article are appropriate.</p> <p>5. The article employed a longitudinal descriptive research method and provided charts and tables to support its conclusions, which can be considered scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. the references in this article seem sufficient and recent. The article cites recent research literature and correctly cites these references, providing strong support for the article's arguments.</p> <p>7. There are redundant annotations in Figure 1, which are recommended to be removed.</p> <p>8. The layout of Table 2 is not standard and it is suggested to rearrange it.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. When using scientific terminology, it is important to follow academic norms. For example, when referring to sample sizes, it is preferable to use specific numerical expressions rather than phrases like "moderate" or "large".</p> <p>2. In the conclusion section, the main findings and contributions of the study could be further summarized and highlighted. This would assist readers in better understanding the importance and significance of the study.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	No	

[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:	Xiu Ji
Department, University & Country	School of Electrical and Information Engineering, Changchun Institute of Technology, China