



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_35605
Title of the Manuscript:	An analysis of Socio-personal characteristics of apple growers and their attitude towards apple cultivation in district Shopian of J&K
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>There is no discussion on the results to tie them up with some comments. There are some serious differences between the 3 altitudes that should be presented in the Abstract and Conclusions sections.</p> <p>Where are Figs 1 and 2?</p> <p>The Introduction section needs to be shortened or the literature data presented should be tied up better. Ask yourself: why do I put all these references?</p> <p>Methodology section must contain details/clarifications needed to understand the parameters measured (media exposure, innovative proneness, etc what are these, how were they measured?)</p> <p>There are some mistakes or clarifications needed in all tables. Commonly the tables must be able to stand alone! So clarify whatever is needed, mainly what are the parameters measured if not clear (i.e. family education: what do you mean, how you separate it in levels?). Similarly, you must clarify in the text!</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	In the literature section, please write in accordance to journal requirements.	
Optional/General comments	<p>I am not sure that both tables and figures (showing the same results) are required.</p> <p>English language could be improved substantially.</p> <p>The per cent should be as 35.4%.</p> <p>The local units should be changed to universal units so all nationals can understand it.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	George Nanos
Department, University & Country	School of Agricultural Sciences, University of Thessaly, Greece