

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_103661
Title of the Manuscript:	Handicraft Sector in India: An Instrument For Rural Economic Growth And Women Empowerment
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:

(<https://www.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. This manuscript can be useful for the scientific community and can help future research on this issue.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript should be revised based on items 7 to 14.</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. The references mentioned in the article are not enough. New and relevant references should be added to the article.</p> <p>7. In the introduction section, the motivations of the study are not well presented. Why did the authors use the proposed method? What are the contributions of the study? All the answers to these questions must be highlighted in the introduction.</p> <p>8. It is suggested to add the "Literature Review" section to the manuscript.</p> <p>9. What are the existing solutions in the most relevant literature and their drawbacks or issues</p> <p>10. The literature reviews should be supported to understand the correlation of presented research results with the state of the art of this research field.</p> <p>11. What are the main criteria for data selection and time period of research?</p> <p>12. What are the disadvantages of your approach? What are the limitations of your research?</p> <p>13. Additional explanations and interpretations of table 2 should be given in section</p> <p>14. I suggest enhancing the last section to better explain because the key results of the research should be expressed in more detail.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are a few grammatical errors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The directions of future research should be stated in the last section.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mojtaba Sedighi
Department, University & Country	Islamic Azad University, Iran