



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_35604
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of existing, desired competencies and skills of apple growers in low and high altitude areas of district Shopian in Jammu & Kashmir:
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

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	<p>In your result and discussion, make sure that each table comes in immediately after its discussion.</p> <p>In each of your table discussion, only outline the positive responses and their percentages. E.g. in table 1. Report only the percentages of the performed task, need training and acquire skills without discussing the not performed and not need, etc. it makes the work more tidy and concise. When 15% performed, it's obvious that the remaining 85% did not perform.</p>	<p>AS tables are put to be on separate sheets.</p> <p>As work was my research during my M.Sc checked by almost 6 members, As per their suggestion, but if you have a look again please!</p>
Minor REVISION comments	Nil	
Optional/General comments	He/she did a great job, only needs few corrections	