



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_41900
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative assessment between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of MGNREGA in Arunachal Pradesh: A case of two districts
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		
Minor REVISION comments	In the abstract the authors need to write methods employed to draw sample from their universe, tools used to collect data from their sample and techniques they followed to analyze the data collected for this study clearly and precisely. Consequently, authors should rewrite their abstract. For example, in their abstract, from line 9-11, authors have tried to mention from whom their collected their data and how many respondents they had but they failed to clearly show methods they follow to find their respondents and tools used to collect data from sample respondents.	Thanks for your valuable suggestions. Sir/Madam, I have included the necessary corrections in the article. I have used probability proportionate to size sampling while drawing the samples for this particular study, which I forgot to mentioned in the abstract. Thanks for pointing it out.
Optional/General comments		