



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_53825
Title of the Manuscript:	Perception of biophysical stresses confronted by the farm women: The socio-economic and ecological interpretation
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>In this study, the authors made a transversal analysis of socio-demographic factors contributing to health and economic rural activity. The authors do not mention if the study was submitted to a local ethic committee, as the study is based on direct interaction with the study population, the article should not be published without an ethic approval.</p> <p>As the study, aims are not clearly written, the last paragraph of the introduction (...It is necessary also....) is more a justification of the study than an aim. The paragraph before is closer to the aim, but you should state that you aimed to evaluate a,b,c,d. Introduction is too long, should be shortened, all literature references with details should be mentioned in "discussion" confronting with your results. Reorganizing the chapter will help to avoid repetition.</p> <p>Definition and number of variables should be reduced, as several variables are correlated to each other (as height and weight to BMI, family income to per capita income, fat intake and calories of fat intake....use the more important (as BMI, per capita income or calories of fat intake etc). this reduces unnecessary text and tables. Although you described all variables, "perceived physical problems " are not defined, it has to be clarified if participants gave spontaneously a list of health problems or if you had a checklist. You also have to list which physical findings you included and in what % they were mentioned by the study population (as part of your table of raw data...). In your limitations, you have to include that different health perceptions of the population can over – or underestimate physical problems (normally lower social classes have a lower perception of good health or health related problems). You also have to make sure that you list in your introduction just the health problems you investigated, as an example, it is not necessary to bring literature data about hearing loss if you did not investigate this.</p> <p>You performed several analysis strategies of the same variables. Please make sure in your aims why you did so (what did you want to achieve with the different analysis?). In your discussion you must highlight why the different analysis was important, which analysis showed what and why it was so important that all different analysis were performed (this is your study!!)</p> <p>All research must be reproduceable, you did not bring the raw data, so it is necessary to include a table with your results (media+- standard deviation or interquartile range 25-75). As an example, at page 17 last paragraph, all the information you mention are not exposed in results, so reading your article I cannot give the correct relevance.</p> <p>Your conclusion should not to interpret your findings and suggest new studies but answer directly to your investigation questions (your aims).</p> <p>In sum, the study brings very nice and important data, certainly it is important to publish them, they just have to be adjusted.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>The authors did not mention it the study was approved by a local ethic commission, which is mandatory for intervention study (interview..)</p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Silke Weber</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>São Paulo State University, Brazil</b>