



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJESBS_11887
Title of the Manuscript:	Incorporating e-mail in teaching activities of the nutrition program at College for Women, Kuwait University: Assessment of a 5-year experience
Type of the 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	1. In the introduction section, the author should clearly state the purpose of the study and related research questions at the end of this section. 2. The major problem of this manuscript is that the author did not provide and discuss previous studies related to the research topic. The whole literature review section is completely missing, so that the reader can not get a whole picture about what have been done in the past. 3. In the methodology section, the author provided clear descriptions regarding the research site. However, since the questionnaire survey is the only research tool used in this study, it is essential to discuss the questionnaire instrument such as the number of items, reliability, validity, etc. 4. Regarding the discussion section, the author mentioned a lot of findings but nothing related to the results of the current study (see pp. 7-9). Besides, no more data should be presented again in the discussion section. Instead, the author should discuss in depth the major and important contributions related to this study.	1. The objectives of the study are currently stated in the introduction section of the revised manuscript. 2. There is currently a section for literature review – but, appropriate in length, in the revised manuscript. 3. The point raised about the methodology section is very valuable. This has been addressed in the revised manuscript. 4. The discussion section currently includes the raised point about more mention of the findings. Also, contributions of the study to the literature as well as futuristic ideas for studies are included in the revised manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The author should follow exactly the APA format in the text citation as well as in the reference list. 2. It is suggested to edit the paper before submitting to the journal. There are a lot of grammatical errors found in the text.	1. This was strictly followed in the revised manuscript. 2. This was thoroughly checked and improved in the revised manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This manuscript is like a report which mainly summarizes the questionnaire survey results. An obvious and important contribution in the academic field is limited. After reviewing the manuscript, it is suggested to do a serious major revision or reject the paper for publication.	The revised manuscript has been improved to be suitable for publication in the Journal.