

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_111818
Title of the Manuscript:	Humanity in Diversity: A Simple Basic Complementary Act to Help the Marginalized and Lonely Elderly
Type of the Article	Short communication

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		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	The manuscript is important for the scientific community. The scope of the study is to improve the functional abilities of the elderly.	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The settings of the study can be mentioned in the title of the study.	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	The abstract of the study is not comprehensive.	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Please check the research design adopted for the present study. More clarity is required on the research design adopted. Abstract: Under the heading of duration and place, the researcher mentioned a sample. Sample details were repeated in the methodology again.	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	The structure of the manuscript is not properly framed. Both quantitative and qualitative aspects are combined in this study.	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	The study incorporates both recent and older research. There are enough references provided. Please make sure that the referenced sources' "title of the study or the topic" is correct, as a few of the titles capitalize the initial letter of each word. Make an effort to do it consistently.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The methodology is not well written. - No much details on FGD and who did whether any interview guide used? - Interventional cross-sectional study- Specify the design adopted by the researcher. - The result and discussion parts are stated in a very vague manner. - What are the parameters used to assess the effectiveness of the social program? Please specify. - Institutions may be provided permission to conduct studies. But still, individual participants consent to being part of the study. 	

Review Form 1.7

	- During the FGD, were the institutional management representatives involved or not?	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The study team's planned visits and social programs may be difficult to comprehend due to the paper's inappropriate writing style, leading to confusion.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Viji Prasad C
Department, University & Country	Yenepoya Nursing College, Yenepoya deemed to be University, India