



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_44521
Title of the Manuscript:	Smart Universities for Smart Cities
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:

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

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	The abstract provided no clear picture of what the paper is all about. The aim, approach, and/or method, finding(s), and conclusion are lacking from the abstract. Purpose of the study What is the need for this study? Establish the problem or gap in knowledge that this paper will fill. Method – Tell your reader the approach, steps, or process you have taken to get to the goals of the paper (in this case review of related literature). The last portion of the introduction should clearly address this and more.. The sub-headings or topics were more or less addressed in isolation. There were no clearly established relationships between sub-topics and the title of the paper, The concepts - "smart universities" and "smart cities" were forgotten, thus each was only mentioned three times, mainly in the introduction and the conclusion The conclusion introduced an undiscussed new concept (geospatial technology instead of focusing on the outcomes and their implications, suggestions and/or recommendations.	Changes in the Abstract have been made. The reference to smart cities and smart universities has now increased in every section of the paper.
Minor REVISION comments	Citation and Reference: There are so many claims or statements (some referring to statistical numbers) that require the author to provide or cite sources. The in-text citation and/ or reference style (APA, MLA, or) has to be consistent. There is missing information on some of the materials in the reference list. In addition, some were not cited in the text.	Reference list has expanded. In-text citations have also undergone a change.
Optional/General comments	Consider expanding the title to show an idea on the specifics the paper is focusing on. Also consider directing the paper to strongly focus on why there should be smart universities for smart cities. The main idea in the paper is that a smart city is sustainable and financial and/or socially inclusive, therefore, the universities in those cities should be so. "Why" should that be? Every sub-topics should lead in providing answers to the "Why" and should always relate to the titles.	Changed the title.Contents under sub headings have also been changed.

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	