

Review comment-2

subject matter of the article is important for the scientific community but not in the current form. The article argues that simulation technology—use-of-force systems, driving simulators, VR, XR, and similar tools—enhances experiential learning for students in law enforcement and public safety programs. Drawing heavily on the author's professional experience and student testimonials, the article presents simulation training as a valuable bridge between theory and practice. The paper discusses simulation use in law enforcement education from the perspective of someone with firsthand experience. This gives the article authenticity and practical insight, especially when describing: the MILO system, driving simulators, and VR-enhanced platforms. The introduction effectively identifies real challenges in higher education: changing student learning styles post-pandemic, increased reliance on technology, tension between online information and expert knowledge, budget constraints in institutions. The author effectively communicates how experiential, high-fidelity simulation enhances: situational awareness, decision-making, communication skills, readiness for real-world conditions. This aligns with established educational theory (experiential learning, constructivism), even though the article does not explicitly cite such theory.

The abstract clearly identifies the topic and scope. It states that the article examines simulation-based learning in higher education, with emphasis on law enforcement and public safety contexts. This gives the reader immediate insight into the focus area. The abstract also explains the relevance and rationale. This situates the topic within current educational challenges.

On the downside, the abstract lacks an explicit research purpose or question. While the abstract discusses themes, it does not clearly state: a central research question, the purpose of the article, and the problem being addressed beyond general trends. The abstract also does not describe methodology or approach. The abstract notes that the discussion draws on: author experience and student testimonials. However, it does not specify whether the article is conceptual, qualitative, empirical, or a narrative review and how testimonials were collected or integrated (even at a high level). For a scholarly article, specifying methodology strengthens credibility. Furthermore, the abstract does not mention limitations or scope boundaries. The abstract implies but does not articulate boundaries.

The article has several writing and editing issues. It contains grammatical errors (“vesicles” instead of “vehicles,” “rather that being,” “the value, they,” etc.), typos, inconsistent punctuation, and formatting issues (backticks surrounding phrases and

spacing irregularities). These reduce professionalism and could undermine credibility in a scholarly context.

The article has no sections. So, I am not able to comment on this.

The article provides a limited use of academic sources. Only two references appear in the entire article, and both relate broadly to simulation and policing but do not provide empirical support for the author's claims, demonstrate breadth of research in experiential learning, and build a rigorous scholarly foundation. Most assertions (e.g., student learning preferences, pandemic effects, technological impacts) are made without citation.

Specific Comments:

I have incorporated the specific comments in the various sections of this document above.