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. Touseef malik**

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

The manuscript presents a community-based digital literacy intervention for older adults in Querétaro, addressing a socially relevant and timely issue. While the study is well contextualized and practically meaningful, it requires moderate revisions to strengthen its academic rigor, analytical balance, and positioning as a research article rather than a program report.

Recommendation: Accept after minor revision.

Detailed Reviewer's Report

STRENGTHS

1. The manuscript addresses digital inclusion among older adults, a socially significant and policy-relevant topic in the Mexican and Latin American context.
2. The intervention is well contextualized and grounded in recognized frameworks on active aging, digital literacy, and social inclusion.
3. The methodological approach combines qualitative techniques and descriptive data, which is appropriate for exploratory community-based research.
4. Results are clearly presented through tables, observations, and participant perceptions, enhancing transparency and readability.
5. The discussion effectively links empirical findings with relevant regional and international literature on digital autonomy and aging.

WEAKNESSES

1. The study remains largely descriptive and at times resembles an intervention report rather than a fully analytical research article.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

REVIEWER'S REPORT

2. The qualitative analysis could be strengthened through clearer coding procedures and deeper thematic interpretation.
3. The perception questionnaire and observational tools are insufficiently validated or described in terms of reliability.
4. Some sections of the discussion reiterate results rather than critically interrogating them in relation to theory.
5. Language and style issues, including minor grammatical inconsistencies and repetition, reduce overall academic precision.