Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_CJAST_115585**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Development of Hybrid-Teaching Factory (H-TEFA) Model on Virtual Lab application**
Type of the Article	

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 **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	It is a chance to implement reforms that have been long-awaited and are aimed at enhancing the digital skills of the educational community. Beyond the realm of education, the problem has also coincided with the provision of a wide range of online services that have been long delayed. On the other hand, this shift towards digital education brought to light the substantial ramifications that the economic crisis has brought about. The article's title is appropriate for the content. The article's abstract is very detailed; yet, it is far too lengthy. You should try to simplify it. Only the most important aspect of the research subject should be included in it. It is appropriate to include the sections and organisation of the paper, but it should also include the literature review. I came across a lot of ideas, and I believe that they ought to be included in this part. The scientific accuracy of the paper is unquestionable. Although the references are adequate, not all of them are from the most current time period. The most recent five years ought to be covered by them.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	There are some sentences that may be difficult to understand, but the overall quality of the text is appropriate for scholarly publications.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Supparang Ruangvanich**
Department, University & Country	**Chandrakasem Rajabhat University, Thailand**