



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Advances in Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AIR_46999 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Development of intellectual learning scale to test knowledge of Large Cardamom Growers of Arunachal Pradesh on Package of Practices of Large Cardamom |
| 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>1. Further discussion or explanation is needed for the use of the range 30 to 80 for difficulty index and 0.30 to 0.55 for discrimination index as criteria for the selection or retention of the test item. (Lines 83-88)</p> <p>2. Base on the given criteria for the selection of an item, item 18 should be rejected since the discrimination index is greater than 0.55 and item 28 should also be rejected since the difficulty index is less than 30. Thus, only 15 items should be selected or retained and hence, the number "17" in lines 11, 87 and 109 should be replaced by "15".</p> | |
| Minor REVISION comments | <p>1. Use more appropriate words. In the abstract, for example, the sentence "In all 32 items were primarily fabricated ..." may be rewritten as "All 32 items were primarily constructed ...". The sentence, "The scores from sample respondents were imperilled to item analysis, embracing of item difficulty index & item discrimination index" may be reconstructed as "The scores from selected respondents were subjected to item analysis, consisting of item difficulty index and item discrimination index." The word "ultimate" may also be replaced by "final".</p> <p>2. The section title "Introduction" should be all capital letters as well, just like the other section titles.</p> <p>3. The word "gages" in line 54 should be "gauges".</p> <p>4. In line 78, the citation Mehta (1958) should be indicated as "[7]" and the reference should be included in the list of references at the last page.</p> <p>5. In line 94, the word "co-efficient" should be "coefficient" and the word "Co-relation" should be "correlation".</p> | |
| 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) | |



SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | <i>Romer C. Castillo</i> |
| Department, University & Country | <i>Batangas State University, Philippines</i> |