



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_47019
Title of the Manuscript:	Employers' Perceptions about the employability of Technical, Vocational Education and Training Graduates in Uganda
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>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	Row 115: The study is from 2010. Is it relevant in 2019? Rows 177-196: A scientific survey needs sample's calculation. How do you know answers from 50 companies are relevant? How many companies received questionnaires? Only 50 and they all answered? Hard to believe.	The target population comprised of 58 prominent employers of TVET graduates in Uganda. The sample size was determined using Krejcie and Morgans' table (1970). Accordingly, for a target population of 58, the sample size was 50. The researchers conveniently administered and followed up the 50 questionnaires which were distributed to the respondents to ensure that they were all properly filled and returned.
Optional/General 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	