

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_110841
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study of the Construction of Smart Healthy Elderly Care City: An Aspect of Foshan City, Guangdong Province
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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>	1. The manuscript provides an important analysis of the development of smart healthy elderly care cities, using Foshan City as a case study. This is valuable for both the research community as well as policymakers interested in aging societies. 2. The title reflects the content and focus of the manuscript. 3. The abstract comprehensively summarizes the key aspects of the paper - the concept of smart healthy cities, the evaluation index system proposed, the empirical analysis of Foshan City, and strategies suggested. 4. The structure with an introduction, literature review, methods, results & discussion, and conclusion sections is appropriate. The subsections within each part are also logically organized. 5. The manuscript appears scientifically sound overall. The methods and analysis are clearly laid out. 6. The references seem sufficient - over 40 sources are cited spanning Chinese and English literature. Most references are from the past 5 years indicating recency. If newer/additional relevant studies are available, they could be incorporated. 7. The language and English quality are suitable. The writing is clear and understandable throughout.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There may be some minor issues to improve : • Missing articles: "is strategic measure" should be "is a strategic measure" (Abstract) • Incorrect prepositions: "research on evaluation index" should be "research on an evaluation index" (Introduction) Missing words: "Considering availability of data" should have "the" before availability (Methodology) Capitalization inconsistencies: • "Smart city" vs "smart City" • "Healthy city" vs "healthy City" Long, complex sentences: • "Strengthening the construction...complex sentences" (Literature Review) • "The development of wisdom and health care..." (Literature Review) Typos/spacing: • Extra space in some references: "Architectural Journal, 2020 (S2)" • Missing periods at ends of some references	
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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hamdani Mostefa
Department, University & Country	University of Tissemsilt, Algeria