

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_87893
Title of the Manuscript:	CHARACTERIZATION AND QUANTIFICATION OF URBAN EXPANSION AND IMPACT ON URBAN PLANNING PRACTICE IN MOROGORO MUNICIPALITY, TANZANIA
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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	NA	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Following minor revisions/improvements are required before the final publication; The abstract of the study needs improvement according to the following arrangement, each part consisting of not more than three or four meaningful stances; 1. Introduction and significance of the issue investigated, and objectives of the study 2. Data sources and methodology 3. Major findings, main conclusion, scope and policy implications of the study Grammatical mistakes are frequent which need to be corrected. Language should be improved to make the research more valuable and impressive. The language used for the article is not too scientific. While writing the research work there must be an evident link and consistency among all its sections which seems not too impressive and thus needs a careful relook. Methodology also needs further elaboration and conclusion must be focused and impressive.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The topic taken-up by the author/s is important and can be a useful academic addition into the concerned field. However, there is some thirst in the article concerning about is construction and significance of the focused area as well as about the need and scope of the study. Removing such minor deficiencies, the worth of the study can be enhanced.	

### 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:	Asad Ali Khan
Department, University & Country	The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan