

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_123375
Title of the Manuscript:	Empirical Investigation Into Attendees' Outlook And Experiences Of DAESI Training Programme
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study Empirical Investigation into Attendees' Outlook and Experiences of DAESI Training is needed for the specified community. However the study has not clearly explained the content need a major revision.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable However, the clear explanation is missing	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Need to add according to the study theme	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Introduction: Problem statement is missing and clear understanding is missing. Methodology: Incomplete. On what basis purposive sampling is used and how respondents are selected. The sample of 80 was included for the study and why only 80 ?? Analytical tools and its statistical things were missing Results: No proper justification (Check in the document) Conclusion: Not as per the format and has to change completely Reference: Not as per the style	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Need major revision in methodology and conclusion. Clear justification is needed in the results. Problem statement can be added in introduction.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Need proper references for substantiating the results	

Review Form 3

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Major revision needed along with typographical errors	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	D. Rafi
Department, University & Country	TNAU, India