

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_106635
Title of the Manuscript:	Landscape Planning and Design Approaches for Ecologically Sustainable Cities
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.journalarja.com/index.php/ARJA/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The topic of the manuscript is very important both for the scientific community and for the general improvement and further development of science in the direction of issues of sustainable development of cities and regions of any country in the world. 2. I offer 2 options for the new title of the article to be chosen by the author: a) Connection of landscape planning with the design of ecologically sustainable cities, or b) Design of ecologically sustainable cities taking into account the main tasks and principles of landscape planning 3. The abstract structurally does not correspond to the general principles of composing an abstract: from the formulation of the goal, the tasks solved in the work, to scientific novelty, practical value, the essence of the work and conclusions. Therefore, it is completely impossible to form any idea about the content of the work by the abstract, except for placing the purpose of the work at the end of the abstract. 4. A more detailed explanation and recommendations about the correspondence of the subdivisions and the structure of the manuscript are provided after the 6th chapter (below the text). 5. The manuscript will become scientifically accurate after finalizing the annotation according to our recommendations and placing all sections according to the new annotation. 6. The main number of links is relatively recent (although there are links that are 20 years old or more). In general, the structure of references is quite subjective (there is no numbering of references in the general list of literature, so it is difficult to follow the quality of these references by text, without placing in square brackets after the author's texts, references to certain sources). <p>Proposals regarding the ecological approach in urban landscape design must be clearly agreed upon by the author after finalizing the tasks of the scientific work. It seems that the author made an attempt to cover all areas related to the sustainable development of cities, landscape design and, in general, the design process. In our opinion, it is necessary to clearly limit the scope of research in terms of purpose and tasks. Then there will be no mess in the proposals when trying to cover all the problems of designing sustainable urban development.</p> <p>A few more wishes regarding the writing of the text of the article: 1) to prevent confusion when reading the text (taking into account the peculiarities of different languages of the world), I suggest expressing the author's thoughts more clearly, adhering to the set goal and tasks of the work, which are formulated to achieve it. 2) There are sentences or phrases in the work that do not have a clear thematic ending, which can lead to a double understanding of them. I recommend making a linguistic correction. 3) I recommend that the sections of the scientific article be submitted by numbers with the names of the sections that will correspond to the texts of the corresponding sections. Based on the existing name of the sections, it is difficult to analyze the structure of the article.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>For non-English-speaking scientists, the answer to this question is very difficult! But there are wishes in this regard in the additional recommendations.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	Without specifying the purpose, tasks and practical readiness for use, the article loses its marketing appeal and significance. All of the above can be achieved by following the recommendations of a valid review.	
---------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

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:	Sankov Petro
Department, University & Country	Prydniprov's'ka State Academy of Civil Engineering and Architecture, Ukraine