

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_97917
Title of the Manuscript:	Rethinking Old Dhaka Jail into Urban Open and Social Interaction Space for People
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:

(<https://www.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript presents a different perspective on the urban space and how the community can benefit if the authorities are ready to act. The author brings to the scientific community a study case from which many other local communities can learn.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title can be considered appropriate to the content and the article's aim.</p> <p>3. The author managed to give a whole perspective on the paper within the abstract and emphasised the importance of the study.</p> <p>4. The section and subsections of the study are clear, and the author made good connections among them.</p> <p>5. As the author mentioned in the methodology section, the article is based on "some literature" review and a field survey. Unfortunately, the survey is presented in general lines without mentioning the target audience, the number of respondents or the addressed questions. Because the article is based on a certain case of local development with high specificity, the scientific level decrease in the favour of everyday reasoning.</p> <p>6. The study is anchored in new and ample references. Some of the references used increase the scientific degree of the paper.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>We kindly recommend the author to review it from the English grammar point of view and also pay more attention to the use of upper and lowercase in subtitles.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The scientific level of the paper can be increased if the target audience, the number of respondents or the addressed questions are mentioned in the methodology section.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Carausan Mihaela Victorita
Department, University & Country	University of Political Studies and Public Administration, Romania