PART 1: Article Title:

	Editor's comment	**Author's comment** *(If agreed with the editor, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here)*
Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Please write a few sentences explaining your answer	Yes, there is a gap in the literature	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	Possible- education vs training, needs elaboration in article or just choose one	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	Yes, but clarity needs to be addressed	
Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	No, grammatical errors present throughout	
Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.	Revisit, grammar/clarity in abstract, Results – numbers reported are inconsistent; not enough information on trainings – what they consist of, when taking etc, too broad	
Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.	yes	

PART 2:

	Editor's comment	
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)*	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	no	
Do you think the article is plagiarized? If yes, please justify your answer and send us some proof.	no	
Do you think a Disclaimer is required to explain the history of this manuscript? (As in most cases chapters of reference books are extended versions of previously published articles in some journals)	no	

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Editor:

Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare he/she can write "I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer" I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer.

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0) **Guideline:** Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7)	**Revision (Grammar, demographics numbers and other results numbers do not add up, did not include when training was received which informs how relevant it is (if received as a student 5+ years prior vs "current"), information on type of training received**

Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)	