



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_51072
Title of the Manuscript:	Iranian Elderly in Sydney, Australia: A Reflection on Life
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Comments on the abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The abstract is brief which is good - 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. “ - 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. <p>Comments on the introduction/Background</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is it possible to merge the background and the introduction? - 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. - The authors' theoretical framework is clear which is good. - Literature review is related to the topic and it is adequate 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The research design (qualitative research study used a phenomenological approach to examine and explore the economic and social disparities facing Iranian elderly) is appropriate - However, the author needs to fully describe it stating not only the sample size but also showing how data were collected 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is good that the findings were descriptive - The author also did well to explain the findings in relation to topic. - Discussion section discusses/analyses findings in relation to topic and objectives. This is good. - 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. 	

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Liamunga Mwiya Imasiku</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Zambia, Zambia</i>