



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Applied Life Sciences International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_45578
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study on Egirdir Nursing Home for Assessment of Landscape Preferences
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**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	<p><b>1. The abstract section needs to be recast. A good abstract must follow the IMRAD format (brief introduction, methods, results and discussions).</b></p> <p><b>2. The general syntax of the paper needs improvement.</b></p> <p><b>3. The methodology is not clear. The study type, sampling designs, data collection procedures and data analytical plan are conspicuously missing.</b></p> <p><b>4. The results are not chronologically presented and needs to be re-organized based on the specific objectives for the study.</b></p> <p><b>5. There is no 'discussion section', though the authors have explained a bit some of the findings from the study. A scholarly discussion that interprets the findings and associate them with existing literature must be carried out.</b></p>	<p><b>1.</b> Thanks to reviewer, the Abstract section is reorganized and rewritten according to JALSI format.</p> <p><b>2.</b> The manuscript carefully edited for both syntax errors and English language improved.</p> <p><b>3.</b> The manuscript's Material and Method section carefully edited. It is a case study for assessments of existing landscape elements and design principles of Egirdir Nursing Home. Hence, the methodology, and data collection conducted under the recent literature reports on similar subjects (score sheet preparation, scoring and calculation of success). However, a comprehensive observation were made within the scope of landscape architecture design principles. We think that this methodology good enough for this case study. The valuable literature findings on similar subject have already mentioned and cited in text.</p> <p><b>4.</b> The results are carefully presented according to a typical research article procedure. Important observations, findings and recommendations are presented in conclusion and recommendations section because it is a case study for landscape architecture view that some assessments and recommendations should be given at the end of manuscript.</p> <p><b>5.</b> The important findings and information's on that case study place are given in result and discussion section. However, after carefully overview on findings and observations, an assessments methodology conducted to score overall quality of that nursing home. Further recommendations are given in Conclusion &amp; Recommendation section with view of a Landscape Architecture.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The recommendations are generally observations and need to be re-written. They must cite particular implementation actors and agencies who would ensure the smooth implementation of the suggestions made in the paper.	Thank you very much for positive opinions on my manuscript.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The objective of the paper is very good as it aims at improving the general conditions of the elderly in the Egirdir nursing home from the perspective of landscape assessment. However, the paper needs major corrections to improve its state.	Thank you very much for positive opinions on my manuscript. Thanks to reviewer, we have carefully edited manuscript. Some syntax errors and English language problems corrected. However, this study was conducted without any funding. Hence we are unable to conduct further research for that subject.

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