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)

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	**Submission ID Ms_ARJGO_83824** **The study entitled "Quality of life among Menopausal Women residing in Dharan Sub-metropolitan City, Nepal." aimed to evaluate the quality of life in relation to the menopausal symptoms among menopausal women.** **Given that there is currently a special focus on the elderly in the field of medicine, this is a descriptive and interesting topic and the research method is well designed. However, this study has some concerns that make it inappropriate for publication. The following are suggested for improvement:** **Abstract:** **- In introducing the samples (women 40 to 60 years old), their menopause must be written. Write: Two hundred menopausal women 40 to 60 years old.** **- The place of sampling is not specified.** **Introduction:** **- The purpose should be stated more precisely at the end of the introduction and should be in accordance with the abstract and discussion** **Methods:** **- The sampling method is not well known. Have the samplings been done at the community level or in specific centers? In the subtitle of Date Collection, it is written: "Two hundred women from the selected wards of the city….."; How were the selected wards of the city selected?** **- Why were not the Spearman correlation test used in data analysis to examine the correlation of quantitative variables (such as age, menopausal age and duration of menopause) and quality of life score and its domains? While this test is more suitable for quantitative variables.** **- In the section on ethical considerations, refer to obtaining informed consent from the samples** **Discussion** **- The beginning of the discussion section is very similar to the introduction section. In the first paragraph of the discussion section, the important and key results of the research should be presented based on the main purpose of the research.** **- The discussion section is very superficially written and needs to be revised and completed. In this section, some of the results have only been repeated and no discussion or explanation has been made about it.** **- For some results, there are no other studies that are consistent or opposite to the results obtained in this study, such as the relationship between MENQOL and marital status, duration of menopause, smoking, and alcohol consumption.** **- In other cases, such as age, only one study is cited, while there are several studies in this field (such as: Webster , 2018 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.maturitas.2017.10.013; Ibrahim 2020 https://doi.org/10.1080/13697137.2019.1656185; …)** **- Write the strengths and limitations of the research at the end of the discussion.** **References** **- References must be updated and new resources must be used.**	

Review Form 1.6

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)* **Yes** **- Obtaining ethical approval from the Institutional Review Committee (IRC), BPKIHS (IRC / 407/014).** **- Compliance with the ethical standards set out in the 1964 Helsinki Declaration.** **- Obtaining informed consent from the samples.**	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Soheila Nazarpour**
Department, University & Country	**Islamic Azad University, Iran**