



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_17091
Title of the Manuscript:	The Engineering of an Undergraduate Nuclear Education Program in Jordan
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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 approach described in the article is interesting. The link between the governmental desire to develop a nuclear program and the obligation to set up a course to meet the need appears clearly. However a reorganization of the structure of the article is necessary to improve the understanding and the accuracy of the information described. Furthermore there are many repetitions in the text like : “The nuclear engineering department at Jordan University of Science and Technology (JUST), is the first and only such department/program in Jordan” and “the lead role of Jordan’s nuclear human capacity building”. NUCLEAR ENGINEERING EDUCATION : the introduction of this part is unnecessary to avoid the unnecessary repetition of the introduction of the article. I suggest to combine the two parts. Logically to mount an educational program, it is necessary to detail: -the need: what skills? -the number and quality of professors, their skills teachers? -the program? Also I proposed to reorganize the article according to this plan. The article is interesting but a large number of changes	1. The Article has been reorganized per your recommendation. 2. Repeated sentences in the text were removed/combined 3. The introduction section of Nuclear Engineering Education was removed, and the content is combined with the Article Introduction 4. The number of professors and their rank in all engineering departments were added in Table 1 5.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	are needed. Some suggestions in the join document. The article is not accurate enough and very highlights the quality of education without necessarily that this is justified.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Information are repeated in table 3 and figure 2. Abbreviations in the tables are not explained or homogeneous.	The Table list details of the nuclear engineering department, were the Figure shows only the number of students.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		