



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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The author analyzes the differences between two groups of respondents that differ in their positions, but does not take into account the fact that they can come from different mental models, interests, and motivations arising from existing differences when answering. This is not mentioned in the article and is not considered. It is more important to take into account that two unequal groups of respondents are compared.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The author considers the distribution to be normal and from this he proceeds with statistical analysis. But this may not be so and needs special consideration.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article should be brought into conformity with the generally accepted form, for example, by introducing the section "Discussion".	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sergey A. Surkov
Department, University & Country	International Institute of Management LINK, Russia