



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>)



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Line 19; different cities please provide examples such as.... Line 26; Thus the different definitions... please provide some definitions to justify your claims Line 30; what qualities are you talking about? Line 41; what is MOOCs? There was no mention of that anywhere in the introduction. At least there should be an element captured in the literature which is also linked to the topic before writing about it separately. That's what introductions are for Line 46; please do not start any sentence with the word 'And' Line 47; Maria Joseph citation not well done Line 65 to 100; the writer mention various researches conducted on gender diversity and cite some good examples but does not provide any citations for these researches Line 101; the citation is not well done Line 137 to 199; gives some examples of some research works without citations Line 240 to 317; no citations	Added the words – mainly in the developed world Have mentioned Albino's study which has collated definitions beginning with hard infrastructure or ICT and gradually including other parameters. New studies on definitions have also been added. Qualities of dynamism, innovativeness and open to disruption have been mentioned in the previous sentence. Included two sentences on MOOCs in the introduction. Sentence has been changed. Citation has been changed
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The work is ok, but the writer needs to adjust the topic and write the work to suit the topic. Honestly, after reading the work, I could not make out what the writer was talking about. It seems the topic is isolated and there are good pieces of information which have just been jumbled together with no link to them. The citations in the work are not good because instead of surnames and year of publication, the writer writes the full names in the work. The writer should kindly take another look at the work and kindly organise the structure and content of the work to suit the topic	Citations have 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)	