

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_123275
Title of the Manuscript:	Socio-Economic Status and factors influencing women's involvement in SHGs program in Ambedkar Nagar District of Uttar Pradesh
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>As India is a developing nation, grass-root development is crucial and the role of SHGs in achieving this cannot be denied. Hence, the paper holds a lot of significance. However, the manuscript suffers from technical drawbacks. The language used needs rectification, certain sections need to be added, and some statements and opinions need to be backed by adequate data. Overall, the paper has scope for publication if the technicalities are taken care of.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The language used is not proper. A better title would be "A study on the socio-economic factors influencing women's involvement in SHG programmes in Ambedkar Nagar district of Uttar Pradesh"</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Recommendations for the abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. From the materials and methods section, it was found that only a schedule was used for the study. Therefore, the word questionnaire should not be used in the abstract. 2. Mention the sampling techniques used. 3. There is no such classification as middle sized family members being 6-8 membered. The use of the words middle and households is inappropriate. 4. There is no such classification as marginal to small landholding. Instead the term 'marginal farmers' may be used. 5. The findings related to binary probit regression need to be provided. 6. Key suggestion(s) may be added. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The study has not clearly mentioned its objectives in the introduction section or in a separate section. In the introduction, it is mentioned that the study shall highlight the perception of SHG participants, but the parameters studied find no such mention. 2. A proper review of literature is missing as a result of which the sources for the parameters used in the study could not be brought forth. Moreover, a proper research gap is missing. 3. Suggestions/ Recommendations/ Policy implications can be added as a separate section. 	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The research methodology needs the following improvements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The population size of 11531 SHGs need to be mentioned under a separate sub-section as 'Population of the study'. • The reasons why the district was selected for the study has not been substantiated by facts and figures, e.g. - Availability of resources (What type? What amount?); High number of SHGs (Provide a comparison with other districts); Promising district of promotion of enterprises (How?); Economic development of SHG members (How?) • Provide a list of the other blocks in the district and the number of SHGs they have. This would clearly show how the number of SHGs in the two selected blocks are higher. • How has the author come to the conclusion that a sample size of 120 would be sufficient for the study? • The sources of secondary data need to be specified more clearly- From which websites, journals, etc., reviews have been done? Which government publications have been used? 2. Table no. 7 is missing under the head "Annual income of the households" 3. Some of the opinions of the author in the summary and conclusion section seem to be based on personal judgement and/or not backed by the collected data, for e.g.: 	

Review Form 3

	<p>“The younger age group of women were expected to stay in home and take care of households”- How has the author come to this conclusion?</p> <p>“Most of the women were illiterate”- In Table No. 2, it shows that 40% of the women were illiterate.</p> <p>“Majority of the respondents having joint family and a family size of 6-8 members”- In Table No. 3, the classification of 6-8 members has not been provided.</p> <p>“Joining in SHGs has provided them economic and social empowerment”- The author has not provided enough data on how they have been empowered economically and socially. A before and after picture could be an appropriate way to highlight this.</p> <p>4. Suggestions/Recommendations/Policy implications should be added.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The study has not properly reflected upon the review of literature done. Recent and/or relevant studies along with their citations may be added accordingly.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, the language needs a lot of correction. Due to improper use of English, the intended message could not be conveyed well.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tamalika Sikder
Department, University & Country	Gauhati Commerce College, India