



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_24193
Title of the Manuscript:	INFLUENCE OF GENDER ON NATIONAL POVERTY ERADICATION PROGRAMME (NAPEP) CAPACITY ACQUISITION SCHEME (CAS) GRADUATES ON THEIR ABILITY TO ACQUIRE TAILORING SKILLS FOR ENTREPRENEURSHIP
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1/ Table 1, line 8, third column female: probably not “Disagree” but “Agree” because mean is 2.80 (> to 2.50). 2/ Introduction is too long. 3/ Table 2 : Why mean combined is only 1.5867 while if you calculate the combined mean for all the responders from table 1 (male and female and for all the 11 items) you find 2.47? Are they the same questionnaire and the same responders than for the first part?	This is true, noticed after my attention was drawn to the error. This has been corrected. Corrections have been effected .
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		