



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	

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	1- There are some unknown vocabularies in the text for me like "anaborescent" in line 48, hope the author check again the text, if he/she had to use these words, it is better add an explanation in Parenthesis 2- Usually in abstract the author directly explains about the subject, the goals, the method and avoid to mention the other's opinion and the references 3- The references should be written in the same format in the text as the usual "(author,year:page)". 4- Each article has "Conclusions" Part. 5- Edit lines 237 and 292-296 and omit line 322	Changed line 48 Disagree Agree added as davisied
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		