

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_118403
Title of the Manuscript:	Group Economics as a Catalyst for Enhancing Housing Supply in South Florida
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.journalajebea.com/index.php/AJEBA/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes. The results are useful in making some head way into the area of research. However, the level of penetration into the field of research could have been deeper.	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, but I suggest the Author to consider this; Content of the introduction is well chosen for the purpose of the paper... " Group Economics as a Catalyst for Enhancing Housing Supply: A case study of Miami, South Florida " The introduction section gives a brief overview of the area of the research and dwells on the various elsewhere studies that were conducted by other researchers in the field of study. The topic has been brought forward in an easy to comprehend manner. This section provides a good overview of the area of research.	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes, but Objectives are missing and the problem the study seeks to solve/address not clearly articulated	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the chapter lengths are well written	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Yes, The results that are derived is in the form of models proposed that establishes the linkages between the factors that could contribute to the insufficient Housing supply in Miami. The Author need to consider other dimensions of the results in the form of proposing conceptual frameworks that can enable understanding the phenomenon that drives the increase of housing supply. It would have been better if the use of tabular displays and graphical display of results were made to realize the potential of visualizing and understanding data and its pattern more easily and more intuitively.	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes- Enough references have been provided. I suggest that Each reference should include DOI number; if not possible, the ISBN and/or web link of the reference should be provided	

Review Form 1.7

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Content of the introduction is well chosen for the purpose of the paper. Enough references have been provided. The chapter length is appropriate. There are minor grammar mistakes.</p>
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Consider revising the topic to read... “Group Economics as a Catalyst for Enhancing Housing Supply: A case study of Miami, South Florida” 2) In general, the paper provides original contribution to the particular fields. However, minor changes are required in order to be qualified for publication. 3) Conceptual frameworks explanation is missing 4) Research objectives missing 5) Problem statement not very clear 6) Methodology not very clear. If possible, make it per objective or variable 7) I don't find any charts here in the manuscript indicating any results of the analysis 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>George Otiki Makori</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Nairobi, Kenya</p>