



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_44136
Title of the Manuscript:	Dynamics of Livelihood Diversification: A Study on Rural Tribal Youth of Tripura, India
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>Informative but needs some minor corrections. The suggested changes are as follows (indicated in the text as well)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Abstract is not well structured. It needs to be changed. 2) Objectives of the study should be more focused and explicitly mentioned. 3) Methodology is good but the explanation for choosing Simpson Index of Diversity (SID) is not adequate. 4) Results are well explained but the Language needs some modification. 5) Listing of reference should follow the journal style. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The abstract has been re-structured 2) The objective of the study is explicitly mentioned in lines 72-73 (page 2) 3) Explanation for choosing SID added in line 130-134 (page 3) 4) Modification in language has been made as suggested 5) The reference section has been edited following journal style (according to recent published paper in Advances in Research)
Minor REVISION comments	NO	
Optional/General comments	May be accepted	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	