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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments 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.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	1. **Very much indeed as the study is responsive to the UNSDGs particularly SDG13 on CLIMATE CHANGE.** 2. **Proposed title: Talent Training Mechanism of Carbon Peak and Carbon Neutralization in New Liberal Arts** 3. **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:** ➢ Research design, ➢ Most salient findings, and ➢ Major conclusion. 4. **The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.** 5. **I have reservation in regard to the scientific correctness/soundness of the manuscript as evidenced in the following comments/questions on methods:** ➢ 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:** ✓ **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.	

	✓ **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. ✓ **Scalability and Implementation:** It doesn't address the practicality of implementing this program across various institutions in China. 6. **The references are sufficient and recent.**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Not quite. The manuscript should be edited by an English language editor.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Constantino T. Ballena**
Department, University & Country	**College of Liberal Arts and Communication, De La Salle University, Philippines**