

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_100569
Title of the Manuscript:	Cultural problems of elderly women in rural and urban areas of Nuh and Hisar district of Haryana.
Type of the 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.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/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>It is an important study. It is centered on addressing challenges with old age</p> <p>I suggest that the author(s) use "challenges" instead of problems. Challenges can be addressed more than problems</p> <p>The abstract has to be rewritten. Too much of likert scale answers repeated in the abstract. The interpretation or findings to these percentages should be rather included than stating the percentages. The abstract is more than a page. Generally should not be more than 200words To an extent. There could be more inferential statistics such as TTest, Relative Index and regressions.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is okay but could be improved. Author should read over or seek additional assistance to strengthen the paper</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I am particularly concerned about the format. It appears to be in a thesis form especially the introductory page. If that is not the format of the journal, I suggest that looks at strengthening the problem statement and linking it to the objectives. No hypothesis are set or consider a research question. The discussion column should be synthesised with existing literature</p>	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Samuel Nortey
Department, University & Country	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science, Ghana