



**SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM**

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>As I have gone through the review reports and the revised article, the article is recommended for publication in your esteemed journal with few clarification as mentioned below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Adaptation of RPI remains in suspense as the author needs to refer when it was used before in any study and what was the result.</li><li>2. There seems to be bias in clearing the content as Author writes the score then could range from 0-66 (0= no eff role, 66= eff role). Again in the next few lines Author writes it ranges from 0-255 (0=no eff role , 255= eff role).</li><li>3. Introduction and Review of Literature part should have also been added separately.</li><li>4. Objective is not clearly stated.</li></ol> <p>The author needs to clarify the above strictly.</p> <p>Further the Editorial Decision is favouring the publication of the above article in the esteemed Journal.</p>	<p>Dear editor, Thanks for your valuable comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The methodological concept has been taken from a thesis. Please see 17 and 20 as reference list.</li><li>2. Actually, the range 0-66 will be for the use of mobile phone for individual respondents, and the 0-255 is the range of Role Playing Index. Minimum value=0x85=0; and maximum value=3x85=255. It has been corrected.</li><li>3. In the author guideline, there is no instruction for separation of introduction and review... <a href="http://www.journalajees.com/index.php/AJAEES/about/submissions#authorGuidelines">http://www.journalajees.com/index.php/AJAEES/about/submissions#authorGuidelines</a></li><li>4. Objective has been stated in below of page 2 under introduction portion.</li></ol>