

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 11/20/2018	Date Review Report Submitted: 11/25/2018
Manuscript Title: Determinants of Implementation and Compliance with Housing Standards for Sustainable Housing Delivery in Bayelsa State, Nigeria	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1078/18	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: NO - Yes/No	
You approve your name as a reviewer of this paper is available on the ESJ's website: NO - Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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>Seems like there are a lot of issues presenting sustainability factors and this factor is not evident in the title.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>It's OK. But should also take out personal comments [i.e., 'painstaking'] and also add in the component of how sustainability 'should' factor into the compliance for housing.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2

<i>Spelling, grammar, verb/subject connections, and issues regarding the APA style need some significant edits.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<p><i>The arguments jump around and do not build. These need to be more clearly stated. Seems like the author is trying to state the issues of non-compliance while also trying to build the case that sustainability factors should be made inclusive in the compliance. It is hard to follow if sustainability is actually already in the compliance edict or if the author is arguing for its addition. The flow is not making these fundamental arguments clear.</i></p> <p><i>Findings need more justification. EX: ‘majority of the low-income urban dwellers in the State are very poor and live below the poverty line which makes compliance very difficult.</i></p> <p><i>Why would being poor mean one would be non-compliant? Or, is this statement just worded awkwardly?</i></p>	
5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>No data from the qualitative analysis is provided, so this makes judging conclusions impossible.</i>	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Need to be set up APA style with no grammatical errors.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an **X** with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Although the author went through a ‘painful’ literature review, there is no summation of this data, no patterns or connections to the different reviews, no data provided or patterns generated from the interviews. Thus, no data is provided. Thus, no reader can draw informed conclusions. This paper has a lot of work to do in an effort to: (1) generate a succinct argument, (2) build the case that connects non-conformity and sustainability, (3) document the patterns found in the data from multiple types of qualitative techniques, (4) make clear that the ‘findings’ come from the data, and (5) get help with grammar and APA style.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

