

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_88179
Title of the Manuscript:	TVET Institutions and Industry Collaborative Practices on Electronics Laboratory Training for Skill Acquisition among Technician Trainees in Kenyas
Type of the Article	Scientific 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:

(<https://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The article is very interesting as it focused on current issues affecting education and training for skill development. The author needs to be commended for identifying the issue as one that needs to be studied. However, the author failed to specifically address the basic electrical/electronics skills that TVET students can develop. Through quality Institution-industry collaboration. This however would have been conveyed via a copy of the interview questions posed and focused group discussion. Adequate linkage and coherence of the paragraphs are needed. References should follow the journal's specified format. Again, the study lacked citations. More citations are needed for it to make more meaning to readers as the findings of earlier studies backs the present. Most of the observed issues are already corrected by the reviewer with only few statements highlighted for the author to revisit.	
Minor REVISION comments	Statement of the problem needs to be clearly written. The author should differentiate between the scope of the study and aims/objectives of the study. Findings of the study should not be confused with the delimitation of the study. The findings should be discussed and backed up with appropriate citations. Again, the conclusion should be based on what was discovered from the study conducted. Recommendations should be itemised distinctively. All essential steps as highlighted in the author's guideline concerning article preparation must be followed.	
Optional/General comments	The idea established in the paper is superb. However, for it to make more meaning for wider readership, all observed flaws should be corrected amicably.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Offia Tugwell Owo
Department, University & Country	Rivers State University, Nigeria