



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_47948
Title of the Manuscript:	Construction of Knowledge Test to Measure Knowledge Level of Apple Growers of Arunachal Pradesh on Package of Practices of Apple
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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>Although this is a potentially interesting paper, it currently reads like a consultancy report. To be suitable as an academic paper, there should be the highlighting of a gap in knowledge which the research is aimed at filling, at least in part, followed by a discussion section in which the claim for contribution to academic knowledge is made. In this case, the contribution to knowledge will centre on the degree to which the research findings confirm or otherwise the hypotheses that are derived from the literature review (i.e. the gap in knowledge).</p> <p>The methodology section would benefit from more details of how the research project was organized and what is the justification of that method. The language used should be specified and there should be more details about the farmers selected (e.g. demographic characteristics).</p> <p>The paper needs some editing for language since there are some unorthodox vocabulary selections to be addressed.</p> <p>The conclusion should include the research limitations and suggestions for future research.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	John Walsh
Department, University & Country	School of Business and Management, Vietnam