



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_21632
Title of the Manuscript:	Subjective Ethnographic Protocol for Work Activity Analysis and Occupational Training Improvement
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The author presented an interesting and relevant article, which, however, needs work. The vast majority of the results is descriptive, but where there is evidence, there is no clear indication of how they were obtained.	Precisions have been written in 3.3.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The author is also desirable to clarify amazing rounding. In addition, the choice of the partition must be made more carefully, because some of them are puzzling.	Regarding rounding, comments were added in abstract, introduction and conclusion. It is right that partition in "results" does not match partition in "discussion". An introduction at beginning of 4. was added to justify the partition in discussion and link it with "results" and to sustain it, comments were added in 3.2.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author should be more carefully define the genre of articles	No comment.