

Reviewer Comment 1

Comment: The abstract could be strengthened by clarifying the methodological approach, and the manuscript would benefit from copy-editing, clearer organization, and slightly deeper engagement with the literature.

Response:

The abstract has been revised to clearly articulate the purpose of the article and to identify it as a reflective, practice-based analysis supported by relevant literature. The manuscript has been reorganized into clearly defined sections consistent with scholarly conventions. Additionally, a comprehensive copy-edit was conducted to improve sentence structure, grammar, and clarity throughout the manuscript. The literature review was expanded to include additional higher-education and experiential learning sources to strengthen the theoretical foundation.

Reviewer Comment 2

Comment: The article lacks clear sections, contains writing and formatting issues, and makes limited use of academic sources. The abstract does not clearly state the purpose, methodology, or scope of the article.

Response:

The manuscript has been substantially revised in response to these concerns. Formal section headings have been added to improve organization and readability. Writing and formatting issues—including grammatical errors, typographical mistakes, and spacing irregularities—have been corrected through a full copy-edit pass. The abstract has been revised to clearly state the purpose, scope, and reflective, practice-based approach of the article. The reference list has been expanded to include foundational and contemporary scholarship in experiential learning, simulation-based education, and immersive technologies in higher education. Student testimonials have been reframed as illustrative reflections rather than empirical evidence to better align with scholarly expectations.

Additional Revisions

- The theoretical grounding of the manuscript has been strengthened through explicit engagement with experiential learning and constructivist theory.
- The conclusion has been revised for concision and academic tone, emphasizing instructional implications and limitations.
- The manuscript now clearly positions simulation technology as a complementary pedagogical strategy rather than a replacement for foundational theory.

Thank you again for the valuable feedback. I believe these revisions significantly

strengthen the manuscript and enhance its contribution to the literature on simulation-based learning in higher education.