



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_37836
Title of the Manuscript:	NATIONAL SCENARIO OF ACADEMIC BACKWARDNESS AMONG SCHOOL GOING RURAL CHILDREN
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 (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	Conceptual errors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Absence of a broader model or theoretical framework in which to frame research - Important sections in the Method, such as Design, Hypothesis and Procedure, are missing. -The Procedure is not adequately described. -The representativeness of the samples is not clear and there is no reference to the selection criteria of the samples (random, stratified, by conglomerates, etc.). - Psychometric data of the instrument are lacking, such as reliability, validity, Cronbach's alpha of the subscales and of the total scale, exploratory and confirmatory factorial analysis, and no reference is made to these characteristics in other studies on this instrument. - Inadequate techniques to analyze in depth the percentages contributed by the authors. -Neither contrasts of means appear or some index of correlation or regression that would bring greater wealth to the study carried out. -The dependent variable "school failure" is not described clearly and operationally, nor how it has been measured. -The answer form to the items does not appear (yes / no, dichotomous, polytomic, Likert scale, etc.). - The introduction refers to academic reasons in nine states and a health reason in one state, and does not allude to family reasons, when 24.36 percent appears in table 4. -In general, it adds more confusion than clarity, and the conclusions refer not to the conclusions of the study but to conclusions obtained by other authors in other research works. -The scale of health problems, presents more physical than psychological items. 	
Minor REVISION comments	Formal errors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very few appointments or references and some very distant in the time. Dunn and Dunn (1986) and Sarawasti et al. (2009) do not appear in the final references. -References in the text incorrectly written, such as: On p. 3: (Karande, S, Kulkarni, M., 2005, it is more correct to write (Karande and Kulkarni, 2005), and on page 15: (Haneesh K. Krishna kumar.p. Sukumaran.S, Riyaz A., 2013) is poorly written, it is better (Haneesh, Krishna, Sukumaran and (&) Riyaz, 2013). 	
Optional/General comments	<p>From the reading of the manuscript the reader could infer (not to deduce) the need that the authors have to justify a greater amount of investment in education in that country where they have carried out the study.</p> <p>In fact, it seems to be more an internal description of the educational situation in which the country is located than a true scientific study.</p> <p>It would be necessary a deep and extensive restructuring of the manuscript, greater depth in the literature and more care with the formal aspects.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Miguel Ángel Broc
Department, University & Country	Psychology and Sociology Department. University of Zaragoza, Spain