



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AIR_41016</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>E-Teaching Competencies for Capacity-Building of Lecturers for Effective Delivery of Vocational Oriented Courses in the Universities</b>
Type of the Article	Original research paper

**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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	This manuscript presents an interesting research. It's based upon a theoretical framework that organized antecedents of the problem, and helps to establish the relevance of the issue. Research questions are clearly enounced. The fact that questionnaire used to collect data has been developed by authors adds an extra value to this work. However, when Methodology is described, there are two aspects that must be cleared up: a) Questionnaire was divided in two sections, needed and performance, and lecturers of computer science and of technical education answered first and second section respectively (lines 192, 197-198) Which were criteria for such division and why lectures were asked to answer only one on the sections? b) For each item, weighted media was calculated. Which were criteria for weight assignment?	Thanks for your valuable observations and corrections. We have noted it and made corrections
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	There are at least two statements that, no matter agreeable they may be, aren't based on the theoretical framework (lines 30-33) or by the results of the study (lines 324-325) I suggest to reformulate them.	Noted and done
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		