



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>I concluded that the authors attended to the referees requirements. Besides, I agree with the referees that this is a good and well-structured and well-written paper.</p> <p>However, I would suggest that the authors perform a minor revision of the manuscript, based on the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - change masters thesis to masters dissertation, as dissertation is internationally more used within the scope of a masters programme and thesis is internationally used for PhD; - clarify the meaning or avoid using masters papers; - review the section under the headline "data gathering instrument" , as they talk about what they analysed instead of talking about the instrument they used to content analysing all the dissertations – did they use a sort of grid our checklist (if so, how is it) to maximize the consistency and the objectivity of the analysis of all the dissertations selected? 	<p>We would like to thank the reviewer for the constructive comments we were provided.</p> <p>Regarding the suggested change of "masters thesis" to" masters dissertation, the concepts are used differently from country to country. In UK, they use it Master dissertation and PhD thesis whereas in US, normally they call it Master thesis and PhD's dissertation i.e. totally opposite. Addis Ababa University is using the US version, and hence, we prefer to retain " Masters thesis" than "Masters dissertation. Hope, the reviewer understands our concern.</p> <p>Comments on "data gathering instrument" accepted, and manuscript improved according to the suggested comments.</p>