



Paper: “Glasgow and Shanghai Cities as Learning Cities for Continuous Education: What Impact On Society as a Whole?”

Corresponding Author: Sherwan T. Ameen

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n13p101

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Bupinder Zutshi
Jawaharlal Nehru University, India

Reviewer 3: Jelena Zascerska
Centre for Education and Innovation Research, Latvia

Reviewer 4: Jacques de Vos Malan
University of Melbourne, Australia

Published: 31.05.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Bupinder Zutshi	
University/Country: Jawaharlal Nehru University, INDIA	
Date Manuscript Received: 11th April 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 18th April 2020
Manuscript Title: LEARNING CITIES AND CONTINUOUS EDUCATION GLASGOW AND SHANGHAI CITIES AS EXAMPLES	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>Title of the paper reflects the contents and views presented in the paper</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	4

results.	
<i>Yes the abstract clearly states the objectives, purpose and major findings of the work</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Not many, the language is Ok and understandable</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The paper is mostly literature oriented, hence methodology has not been indicated</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>Title represents what the body of the paper explains</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Yes</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Yes they are comprehensive</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	Yes
Accepted, minor revision needed	No
Return for major revision and resubmission	No
Reject	No

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The author has explain the theoretical strategies adopted by the two cities to make them worthy of representing as Learning Cities. Perhaps few statistics could have been given to supplement the information.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: The paper is a short paper not a major research oriented papers.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision. *ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Reviewer Name: Dr. Jelena Zascerinska	Email:
University/Country: Centre for Education and Innovation Research, Latvia	
Date Manuscript Received: 15 April 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 19 April 2020
Manuscript Title: LEARNING CITIES AND CONTINUOUS EDUCATION GLASGOW AND SHANGHAI CITIES AS EXAMPLES	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0466/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>Use of the semicolon or any other punctuation could ease the understanding of the title. Also word order in the title could give more impression on the investigated topic.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LEARNING CITIES AND CONTINUOUS EDUCATION: GLASGOW AND SHANGHAI CITIES AS EXAMPLES or 	

- GLASGOW AND SHANGHAI CITIES AS LEARNING CITIES FOR CONTINUOUS EDUCATION, etc	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There should be no citing in the abstract. Abstract is written in one paragraph, no division of the abstract into smaller paragraphs.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> In scientific papers, there should be “that is why” instead of “that’s why” in the abstract. On Page 3, there should be “features of a learning city”. On Page 5, there should be “local competitiveness”.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The author only offers three areas for analysis of learning city. No study methods are highlighted.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Use of tables and figures in the Section “Comparison...” would be beneficial for the reader.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The Section “Conclusions” could be divided into paragraphs for better visibility of the main ideas proposed by the author.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Use of the references is ok. However,</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Not all the cited works are included into the list of references</i> - <i>the author does not cite the works in his paper in a proper way: the authors changes years, names of authors and co-authors and their order, etc.</i> - <i>the reference “Glasgow Learning Alliance...” is missing the information about the publishing house.</i> 	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	

Reject	
--------	--

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Thanks to the author for the interesting topic s/he develops.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No extra comments

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr Jacques de Vos Malan	
University/Country: University of Melbourne, Australia	
Date Manuscript Received: 21 April 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 22 April 2020
Manuscript Title: Learning cities and continuous education: Glasgow and Shanghai cities as examples	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 66.04.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5

<i>Yes, the title is clear but could incorporate one more line to reflect the principal conclusion, e.g: "Learning cities and continuous education: Glasgow and Shanghai cited as examples. What impact on society as a whole?"</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The abstract clearly presents the objects but does not discuss methods beyond referring to "focus" and "assess" as tools. In some ways the paper could be said to represent a literature review plus personal commentary.</i>	
<i>The results of the work are not anticipated in the abstract - the "comparison synopsis" and later conclusions could be referred to in the abstract, as motivation for the work.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>The paper is comprehensible, though awkward to read, as the use of English is often not idiomatic.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Perhaps an explanation of why these two cities were chosen for comparison would have been useful. Was it just because data was available? If so, why so little statistical evidence from Glasgow? Both citations of other scholars as well as statistics are used as evidence, but not consistently. This could be addressed in the methodology description.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>The paper presents evidence in the form of references to the work of other scholars, but then draws certain conclusions based simply on the weight of evidence, without citing conclusions reached by other experts. In the case of Shanghai, statistics provide 'hard' data which is not provided for in the case of Glasgow. Citizen participation is mentioned but no examples are provided.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The paper represents an interesting overview of the concept of a 'learning city' and contrasts two different examples of cities working through the process (and the fact that the aspiration to become and remain a "city of learning" <u>is</u> a process could be discussed. There are some important conclusions drawn, but these are not fully supported by references. The danger is that the conclusions are seen only as the author's personal opinion.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Yes there are general references provided but I would have hoped for more specific citations to support some of the key conclusions.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I have provided some possible areas for improvement in the evaluation above. There are further notes in the reviewed (track-change) text attached, along with typos. I'm happy for that to be shown to the author if that will be useful.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

It's a paper that has the potential to be more significant than it is at present. I would encourage the author to take it to the next level.