

Editor's Comment:

I hope You are doing well.

I made a review of the comments of two referees and the revised article. The opinions of the second referee were almost completely approved of all the parts of the article and he/she did not have any specific objections. But the first referee has made some objections that seem to be reasonable. For example, as the first reviewer pointed out, what was done in this study was not to examine the effects or effectiveness of the courses.

I think even contrary to what the author(s) have claimed, they have not used the causal-comparative or ex-post facto research method in this study. To implement this research method, it is necessary to compare before and after, as well as with and without situations, while none of them are reported in the text of the article. Moreover, The authors of the article have not provided specific explanations in front of the referees' opinions that would help me in the evaluation and final decision. In addition, I also agree with the first reviewer's comments about the shallowness of the abstract and literature review.

In general, my conclusion is that the article has many scientific flaws, most of which were introduced by the first reviewer, but the respected authors did not try to fix them. Accordingly, in my opinion, this article is not acceptable for publication in the Journal. But the Editorial Board of the Journal can also reflect my opinions to the authors so that they can revise the article, even briefly, which will correct the title and research method and resend the article if they wish.

Yours.

Editor's Details:

Prof. Nooripoor Mehdi
Yasouj University, Faculty of Agriculture, Iran.