

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55268

**Title:** *Learning without age limits: an experience of digital inclusion among older adults in Querétaro*

### Recommendation:

Accept as it is .....

✓Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision .....

Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		√		
Techn. Quality		√		
Clarity		√		
Significance			√	

Reviewer Name: **Dr. Anam Zehra**

### Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

The manuscript describes a community-based digital literacy initiative for older adults in Querétaro, focusing on a timely and socially significant issue. Although the study is well situated within its context and demonstrates clear practical value, moderate revisions are needed to enhance its academic rigor, improve analytical depth, and more clearly position it as a research study rather than an implementation report.

**Recommendation:** Accept after minor revision.

## Detailed Reviewer's Report

### STRENGTHS

1. The manuscript examines digital inclusion among older adults, a socially important and policy-relevant issue within the Mexican and broader Latin American context.
2. The intervention is appropriately situated and informed by established frameworks related to active aging, digital literacy, and social inclusion.
3. The combination of qualitative methods and descriptive data is suitable for the exploratory nature of community-based research.
4. Findings are presented clearly using tables, observational notes, and participant perspectives, which enhances clarity and transparency.
5. The discussion successfully connects the study's findings with relevant regional and international literature on aging and digital autonomy.

### WEAKNESSES

1. The study is predominantly descriptive and, in some sections, reads more like an intervention or project report than an analytical research article.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

2. The qualitative analysis would benefit from clearer explanation of coding procedures and more in-depth thematic interpretation.
3. The perception questionnaire and observational instruments are not sufficiently described or validated in terms of reliability.
4. Portions of the discussion repeat the results rather than offering critical engagement with relevant theoretical perspectives.
5. Minor language and stylistic issues, including grammatical inconsistencies and repetition, detract from overall academic precision.