

Paper: **“Stuck in Slums: A Case Study of Slums in Islamabad, Pakistan”**

Submitted: 04 December 2020

Accepted: 11 January 2021

Published: 31 January 2021

Corresponding Author: Persis Samuel

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n2p56](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n2p56)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Alev Erarslan
Istanbul Aydın University, Istanbul, Turkey

Reviewer 4: Blinded

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 11 th December, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Why are people stuck in slums? Case of slums in Islamabad, Pakistan	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1282/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: No	
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.	4
<i>Title Clearly define the scope and aim of the study</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Abstract is well written and clearly presents the objectives or the research, methodology used for analysis and results of the study.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Manuscript is free of grammatical and spelling mistakes, structured properly according to generally acceptable manuscript standards</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Research methodology is well defined and, and sample selection have been justified.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>This study based on qualitative research approach, and there is no error</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Religion is used for difference of two groups, and the conclusion drawn in this study reasonably defend it. Conclusion of the study are accurate and supported by the argument and methodology.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>References and citations need to be revisited. Some citations are not standard</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):

Dear authors, your efforts are amazing and manuscript is well structured and idea is unique. However, there is always a room for improvement, I appreciate you if you revisit the citations and references and add a little bit more literature about the religious aspects of slums dwellers around the world.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This study is important in urban studies, as it covers the slums of Capital of a developing country. It will help to understand the reasons why slums dwellers are not able to leave it and how to make their life more reasonable.

I recommend this paper to be published.

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: Alev Erarslan	Email:
University/Country: Istanbul Aydın University, Istanbul/TURKEY	
Date Manuscript Received: 11.12.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 14.12.2020
Manuscript Title: Why are people stuck in slums? Case of slums in Islamabad, Pakistan	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1282/20	
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.	4
<i>the title is very attractive</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
the authors have clearly stated all their aims, methods and consequences in the abstract.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
<i>(There is no gramattical errors.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(yes the method is well explained in the text)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
Yes, the results are very clear and do not contain errors.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
the results includes both general and derived results.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>the references are adequate.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: