



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_13050
Title of the Manuscript:	Research as Stories: a subjective academic narrative
Type of the Article	Literature review

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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The study is theoretical based on organized literature review using previous studies that support the researcher argument. The article is well written and articulated. The points are clear and the author is addressing the main topic well.</p> <p>The argument leading to the need for this study to be conducted (Statement of the Problem) is well written. Lacks supporting literature as well.</p> <p>As for the significance of the study – actually there is voluminous evidence that exists regarding the efficacy of the study. The literature review in the introduction section proves this fact.</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Supporting literature added after pp91</p> <p>Agree</p>