



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_49420
Title of the Manuscript:	MGNREGS-Aquaculture Convergence: An Experience from 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>)



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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract should be brief indicating the statement of the problem, objectives of the work, applicable concept, data collection and analysis, significant findings and conclusions. But the author itemized and discusses them. The abstract needs to be re-written 2. State the aim of the research work in the introduction 3. Remove the border of the tables 4. Anonymous is not a reference 5. Most of the references miss out page, volume and issues 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract has been re-written in the light of observations made and the word numbers have been downsized from 343 earlier to 319 now. 2. Incorporated in the introduction as advised. 3. All the borders have been removed. 4. Revisions made in accordance with the observation. 5. Due incorporations of page, volume and issues have been made. However, there remains points of disagreement specific to the following sl.nos. of the references cited. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. (7) <i>Census of India</i>: as a supplementary initiative by the office of the Registrar general and Census Commissioner, Ministry of Home Affairs, Govt. of India, population data are being made available these days through digitized system in excel format, for which no page number is provided. So in accordance with the standard international practice, web location was provided as a ready reference for the benefit of all interested viewers. ii. (11) <i>Directorate of fisheries</i>: Here also the reference was cited from the official website of the Directorate of Fisheries, Govt. of Tripura in a single page only and therefore that specific web location was referred to. iii. (12) <i>The MGNREGA: Status of Work Completion (State: Tripura). Government of India</i>: this is the MIS data of MGNREGA as available only in hyperlinked excel format maintained by the NIC and no page/volume no./issue no is provided thereat.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key words are arrange alphabetically 2. Re-write the fish productivity in water bodies 3. Minor grammatical errors 4. Title should not carry numbering 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Done as advised. 2. Re-written the fish productivity in water bodies. 3. Revisited the manuscript and due corrections in grammatical errors were made. 4. Title has been modified in line with the observation.
Optional/General comments		

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)	Not applicable as no ethical issues are associated with the manuscript.