

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JERR_117181</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Urban growth affects the social environment in Yemen's cities: Environmental and climate data in Yemen's cities</b>
Type of the 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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The manuscript not really important for scientific community. There are no new finding compared to previous studies.</p> <p>2. Yes it is. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. Not really. The abstract of the article so long but does not state the main research issues. Concepts such as: "Climate, Environment, Social Relations and Urbanization" also not given in the introduction.</p> <p>4. Not really. Subsections and structure of the manuscript aren't appropriate. The remaining limitations of the study have not yet been mentioned. Cautiously with segment repetition error "First: Since the majority... Second: Strengthening the spirit of belonging of the city's inhabitants... Thirdly: Action to strengthen the spirit of participation... developing world's urban environment."</p> <p>5. I don't appreciate scientifically and reliability of the manuscript because the author used the method of synthesizing secondary documents from many sources but do not specifically list how many articles or selection rules. Research methods are not clearly.</p> <p>6. No they are. The references not really sufficient and recent. Besides, there are documents that are not deeply related to the research issue, so the author is requested to filter them.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bui Ngoc Hien
Department, University & Country	HoChiMinh City Cadre Academy, Viet Nam