



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEMT_51072</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Iranian Elderly in Sydney, Australia: A Reflection on Life</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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><b>Comments on the abstract</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The abstract is brief which is good</li> <li>- It is also good that the abstract has included a major recommendation of the study e.g., when it is stated that “The result indicates that the life of these elderlies can be enhanced by supporting various social and economic services and, by providing ongoing English language classes, a better quality of life for this segment of the population will be reached. “</li> <li>- However, right from the onset the abstract needs to bring out clearly what the study investigated in general, the specific focus of the study, and how data were collected.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments on the introduction/Background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is it possible to merge the background and the introduction?</li> <li>- The introduction has not briefly described the topic being evaluated sufficiently. It will be appreciated if in the introduction, the author states the problem or knowledge gap clearly followed by the objectives of the study.</li> <li>- The authors' theoretical framework is clear which is good.</li> <li>- Literature review is related to the topic and it is adequate</li> </ul>	<p>Re focus of study, the main issue concerned in this study has been explained in the Abstract as, “...were asked to reflect upon their social and economic experience in Australia”. However, some corrections being made. The sentence on line 5 has been changed, accordingly [<b>see modified Abstract</b>].</p> <p><b>Possible merge of Background and Introduction:</b> I/we think background and introduction topics are two separate entities. Introduction tend to familiarise the reader to the topic of study [here migration]. Background on the other hand, familiarises the reader with the specific group in study [Iranian elderly migrants], facing the consequences of their migration to the new locality</p> <p><b>In the introduction state the problem or knowledge gap clearly followed by the objectives of the study:</b> A few changes in the Introduction being made [<b>See modified Introduction</b>].</p> <p>I/we believe the <b>Problem or Knowledge</b> were clearly stated in the two questions raised in the Methodology. Mainly, the social and economic experiences faced by the elderly Iranian migrants and mechanisms they used to cope with the social and economic difficulties. In the meantime,</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Methods</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The research design (qualitative research study used a phenomenological approach to examine and explore the economic and social disparities facing Iranian elderly) is appropriate</li> <li>- However, the author needs to fully describe it stating not only the sample size but also showing how data were collected</li> </ul>	<p><b>Fully describe not only the sample size but also how data were collected</b></p> <p>I also believe the issue of how data were collected were adequately described in the Methodology section. However, the issue being revisited, and a new paragraph added to the end of this section [<b>see Methodology</b>].</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is good that the findings were descriptive</li> <li>- The author also did well to explain the findings in relation to topic.</li> <li>- Discussion section discusses/analyses findings in relation to topic and objectives. This is good.</li> <li>- The conclusion covered all required issues. However, it is too long. Some the points in the conclusions can be written as recommendations toward the end of the discussion.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Conclusion too long and suggest points raised in Conclusion made to recommendations towards the end of Discussion:</b> I/we agree with the suggestion and changes are made to address these issues [<b>See Discussion, Conclusion and new Recommendations</b>].</p>



SDI 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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Here are ethical issues concerned and addresses in the application form to the University of Wollongong Ethics Committee:</p> <p><b>Consent process:</b> A specially Consent Form were signed by the participants, prior to each interview</p> <p><b>Risk and Benefits:</b> Physical and psychological and emotional issues are considered prior to the engagement in the research study.</p> <p><b>Locality of the interviews:</b> Interviews conducted and held in localities, where they felt comfortable and "at ease".</p> <p><b>Recruitments:</b> Mixture of Iranians, men and women of age 65 and over with at least residency of 6 months were asked to participate in the study.</p> <p><b>Confidentiality and Privacy:</b> Interviews were tape recorded and after use were stored in electrical form and then deposited in University's [particularly established depo] for 5 years.</p>	<p>The University of Wollongong, like other universities in Australia, are very much concern and restrict about ethics in research. No research study can be conducted without the approval of the University's Ethic Committee. I/we received the ethics approval for this research, prior to conducting interviews.</p>