

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_83824
Title of the Manuscript:	Quality of life among Menopausal Women residing in Dharan Sub-metropolitan City, Nepal.
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.journalarjgo.com/index.php/ARJGO/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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The authors' article is a study that evaluates the Quality of Life of menopausal women from Nepal toward a questionnaire. The aim declared in the abstract is different to announced in the Discussion “The main objective of the study was to assess the quality of life of menopausal women and find out the association between reproductive and lifestyle characteristics to quality of life indices“	
Minor REVISION comments	Usually, the Kruskal Wallis and Mann-Whitney U tests are not used to evaluate the association between two variables. Please use the correct test. The authors do not specify the statistical significance considered, and not defined what is “high score” or “low score” Please explain details about how was the random sampling technique, and how obtain the mean score. The discussion deserves to be enriched with more works that evaluate similar variables since the mention of some results is repeated	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Sheila Irais Peña Corona
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México