



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	_ Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_27125
Title of the Manuscript:	The Advantages of Reserve Officer Training Unit (ROTU)'s Activities To future TVET Teachers
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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://sciencedomain.org/journal/45/editorial-policy>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Please report more on the result of interview. Six participants are interviewed. There is no counting of the commonality among their opinions. Or Six participants but only 5 quotes. The article could not let me grasp the results of 6 interviews.	This is qualitative study. In the report, the citations is only example of data from some participants. So, that why I have not reported all. I have not analysed the data in the report. I reported after I analysed. The citation is only example in the report.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The number of participants interviewed are not clear Line 149-150 : "a total of six participants in the study were selected as a sample, two officers trained, two coaches and ten students". Should it be two students?	Yes only six. 2 students. I have corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		