

Paper: **“Institutionalising Urban Climate Action: Recent Recognitions”**

**Submitted: 06 January 2023**

**Accepted: 28 January 2023**

**Published: 31 January 2023**

Corresponding Author: Ama Kisiwah Boateng

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n2p146

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Buskó Tibor László  
University of Public Service, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Hamzo Khan Tagar  
College Education Department Government of Sindh, Pakistan

Reviewer 3: Blinded

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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 Buskó, Tibor László PhD	
University/Country: University of Public Service, Hungary	
Date Manuscript Received: 12 Jan 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 16 Jan 2023
Manuscript Title: What does scholarship on institutionalizing urban climate action say?	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0141/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>

The article intends to offer a systematic overview of the current standing of its topic with the intention to map existing gaps in our knowledge and understanding of urban climate change management. I suggest the revision of the title due to the following (mostly stylistic) problems:

1. The word “scholarship” seems to be easy to be misunderstood in a title offering little context. To use it instead of “science”, “(scientific) research”, “(scientific) knowledge” and the like seems to me a bit too old fashioned, pompous or emotionally loaded.
2. I would not advise the use of a question as the title of a scientific article unless a subtitle of explanatory nature is added.
3. The title does not mirror the real value of the article, namely the “added value” it creates, namely the identification of new recognitions readily applicable in practice.

Suggestion for a title: Institutionalising urban climate action: Recent recognitions. (or similar)

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
---	----------

The presentation of objectives, methods and results I have found pretty clear and relatively easy to follow.

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
---	----------

The academic language used in the article meets my expectations. Minor mistakes (e.g. the unnecessary use of commas after the abbreviation “e.g.”; mixing -ise and -ize spellings within the text; missing periods at the end of sentences within table cells and sometimes also within the text; repetitions, especially in the Conclusions) should be corrected. Also, the formatting should be double-checked (different font within Table 1, forgetting about hyphenation, the table caption for Table 2 missing, the unusual formatting of the References section.).

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
--	----------

*(Please insert your comments)*  
I see no problem there.

<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
--	----------

*(Please insert your comments)*  
The author provides what is promised in the introduction.

<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
---	----------

*(Please insert your comments)*  
The Conclusions part contains more of a summary, therefore I suggest the modification of the subsection title. Also the aforementioned repetitive style should be corrected.

<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
---	----------

*(Please insert your comments)*

I see no reason to use centred alignment in the references. I suggest to check the guide for formatting requirements.

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

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

I would like to suggest for the author to consider the reader's point of view a bit better and offer more detailed explanations concerning the findings and their practical use (models for adaptation, good practices, etc.) in the future. I guess that the author will continue the research also in this direction, and am eagerly looking for its continuation.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

Nothing further.

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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 HAMZO KHAN TAGAR	
University/Country: Karachi Pakistan	
Date Manuscript Received: 19 January 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 23 January 2023
Manuscript Title: What does scholarship on institutionalizing urban climate action say?	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Should be more simplified and attractives</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Well written</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>no</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>well</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Results are significant</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Concluded well</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Followed templet</i>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>accepted</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>Outline may be revised</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**