

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_115738
Title of the Manuscript:	Talent Training Mechanism of Carbon Peak and Carbon Neutralization in New Liberal Arts: a Chinese Perspective
Type of the 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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Very much indeed as the study is responsive to the UNSDGs particularly SDG13 on CLIMATE CHANGE. Proposed title: Talent Training Mechanism of Carbon Peak and Carbon Neutralization in New Liberal Arts The abstract is not quite comprehensive. It only presented a concise description of the focus of the study and its aims. The author/s should include a brief description of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Research design, ➤ Most salient findings, and ➤ Major conclusion. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. I have reservation in regard to the scientific correctness/soundness of the manuscript as evidenced in the following comments/questions on methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Under 3.2 Research Design, the opening statement reads, "Through literature research, we will examine the relevant educational research experience of carbon peak and carbon neutralization." HOW WERE LITERATURE RESEARCH COLLECTED? What INCLUSION and EXCLUSION CRITERIA were utilized in determining which studies should be constitute the corpus of the present paper? How was the study corpus analysed? ➤ It also reads, "We will then combine this with the current state of development of carbon peak and carbon neutralization in China." HOW DID AUTHORS COMBINE THE LITERATURE RESEARCH WITH THE CURRENT STATE OF DEVELOPMENT . . . IN CHINA? What framework was utilized to do this? It presented SITUATIONAL [misspelled in the manuscript] ANALYSIS, but it was not described what this is and for what—methodological relevance. ➤ Finally, it reads, "we will propose a mechanism for cultivating talents in carbon peak and carbon neutralization in the new liberal arts from China's perspective, using logical reasoning and deduction." HOW WERE DEDUCTION AND LOGICAL REASONING DONE? What framework did the authors use? ➤ THE FOREGOING QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS CAST DOUBT TO THE VALIDITY OF THE FINDINGS OF THE PRESENT STUDY AND TO ITS OVERALL SCIENTIFIC CORRECTNESS AND SOUNDNESS. THESE SHOULD BE TAKEN VERY SERIOUSLY BY THE AUTHORS WHEN THEY REVISE THEIR MANUSCRIPT. IN DOING SO, QUALITY AND STANDARD OF SCHOLARLY PUBLICATION IS COMPLIED WITH. ➤ Figure 1 was not clearly described. ➤ While the second objective of the study (to construct a talent training mechanism that meets current requirements and provides strong support for the reform and sustainable development of higher education in China) was answered in the manuscript under the RESULTS section, the following points may be considered by the authors when revising this section of the manuscript: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Specificity: While the framework is comprehensive, details on specific courses, projects, or partnerships with enterprises and institutions could be beneficial. ✓ Evaluation and adaptation: It mentions an evaluation mechanism but doesn't elaborate on how feedback would be used to adapt and improve the program. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you for your comments. Dear reviewers, our paper is indeed carried out from a Chinese perspective. If the Chinese perspective is deleted, the title of the paper will not match the content of the paper. So, we apply to you to keep the original title. We have completed the revision according to your guidance. Thank you for your comments. Dear reviewers, there is really not much academic research on talent training mechanism of carbon peak and carbon neutralization in new liberal arts. The literature we have collected is also all-inclusive. A few related materials include news, research reports, papers, books and so on. For this reason, we have not explained these materials in detail. As the research on this problem is in the early stage, the content of this paper is more inclined to the countermeasure problem. Therefore, we use the methods of logical deduction and reasoning to carry out related research. As you mentioned, this research method does not have the advantages of quantitative research and case studies, but at present, it is more suitable for the problems we study. According to your guidance, we will adopt a variety of research methods in the future to improve the research quality of this article. <p>We have made a supplementary explanation to figure 1, according to your guidance.</p> <p>In view of the fact that you mentioned that the research on some issues is not specific enough, such as not proposing some specific carbon neutralization courses, the reason for this phenomenon is that the research goal of this paper is to propose relevant mechanisms, not specific measures. Of course, the suggestions you have given are very good, and we will put forward more detailed measures in future studies.</p>

Review Form 1.7

	<div>✓ Alignment with current needs: it doesn't explicitly discuss how the program would align with current industry demands or specific needs identified by potential employers.</div> <div>✓ Scalability and Implementation: It doesn't address the practicality of implementing this program across various institutions in China.</div> <div>6. The references are sufficient and recent.</div>	6. Thank you for your comments.
<div>Minor REVISION comments</div> <div>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</div>	Not quite. The manuscript should be edited by an English language editor.	We have perfected the language once again.
<div>Optional/General comments</div>		

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>	