

Paper: “Singing from the Same Hymn Sheet? A Semantic and Convergence Analysis of the Extent to Which ‘Smart’ is Similarly Understood and Applied Across Energy, Transport, and Waste Management Sectors of Urban Planning”

Submitted: 26 December 2024

Accepted: 25 February 2025

Published: 31 March 2025

Corresponding Author: Vincent Onyango

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2025.v21n8p120](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2025.v21n8p120)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Benedict Okundaye
University of Huddersfield, UK

Reviewer 2: Iresha Madhavi Lakshman
University of Colombo, Sri Lanka

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is straightforward and appropriate, but it might be more precise. It might, for example, expressly state the emphasis on "energy, transport, and waste management" or the use of "semantic and convergence analysis." This would provide a better understanding of the study's scope and methods.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract offers an excellent explanation of the paper's aims, methodology, and conclusions. However, it may be enhanced by quickly stressing the specific focus sub-areas or highlighting the study's shortcomings or a lack of geographical context. This would allow readers to have a more fair perspective of the paper's contributions and limitations.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The language is straightforward, formal, and intellectual, with minimal grammatical faults. However, several sentences are complicated or wordy and might be streamlined for easier reading. For example, "imbuing smartness into the anthropic, functional, and physical subsystems of any complex urban system is not well understood" may be rephrased to improve clarity.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodologies are the article's strongest aspect. PRISMA criteria for systematic literature reviews and NVivo for data analysis are rigorously followed and clearly documented. The incorporation of Semantic Consistency Theory and Convergence Theory establishes a strong theoretical framework. The process is straightforward and reproducible.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the article is well-structured and rationally organised. It gives deep insights into how the term "smart" is understood and applied across the three industries. However, the absence of geographical context and the excessive dependence on textual analysis are significant shortcomings. Incorporating case studies or practitioner viewpoints would improve this section.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion effectively summarises the findings, emphasising the importance of standardised terminology and transformative effects. However, it may be enhanced by explicitly recognising the study's shortcomings (such as a lack of regional context) and making more specific recommendations for future research.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are comprehensive, up to date, and pertinent to the subject. They contain a combination of classic and contemporary pieces that show a deep involvement with the literature. The citation style is consistent and correct.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear distinguished colleagues,

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this research and academic field. The article, "Singing from the Same Hymn Sheet? Extent to Which the Term 'Smart' is Similarly Understood and Applied Across Sectors of Smart Urban Planning: A Literature Review" investigates the notion of "Smart" in urban planning, namely its use in the energy, transportation, and waste management sectors. It conducts a comprehensive literature study and semantic analysis to assess its consistency and convergence. The review identifies strengths, problems, and opportunities for growth. The research article criticises the eco-modernist approach, highlighting its shortcomings in solving global issues such as climate change and social injustice. It advocates for standardised vocabulary and frameworks in smart urban planning to provide clarity and uniformity. The article also emphasises the convergence of aims and applications, offering a methodology for analysing the coherence of smart urban planning projects that might be used to guide future research and policy development.

Article Strength:

The article takes an interdisciplinary approach to understanding smart urban planning by combining urban planning, technology, and policy research. It employs Semantic Consistency Theory and Convergence Theory to give a solid theoretical foundation for analysing smart urban design. The systematic process, which employs the PRSMA standards for literature evaluation and NVivo for data coding and cluster analysis, guarantees transparency and repeatability. The paper also presents sector-specific

insights into energy, transportation, and waste management, which will be valuable to policymakers and practitioners implementing smart solutions in specific domains. The report also highlights gaps in the present discourse, including the absence of transformative results and an overemphasis on technical deployment, which is pertinent given the increased emphasis on sustainability and fairness in urban planning.

Article Failings:

The paper has various shortcomings, including a narrow range of fields, an overreliance on textual analysis, a lack of regional context, and uncertainty in transformative effects. While energy, transportation, and waste management are vital, they do not cover the entire scope of urban planning. The research also makes extensive use of textual analysis, which may not completely reflect real-world applications or the opinions of experts and policymakers. Furthermore, the study fails to effectively address regional or cultural variances in urban planning processes, and a more extensive examination of what constitutes "transformational change" in urban planning might help to fill the gap in precise definitions of transformational results.

For this article, I suggest:

- keeping critical tables in the main body, such as Table 1, Table 3, and Table 5, as they provide essential evidence for the convergence analysis and are frequently referenced in the discussion. Secondary tables, such as full correlation matrices or extended word frequency lists, should be moved to the appendix (and referenced accordingly in the main text), as they are less central to the core argument. The PRISMA flowchart should also be moved to the appendix, as it is primarily methodological and not critical to understanding the results.
- The authors should explain why they did not broaden the sectoral scope of "Smart" urban planning, include practitioner viewpoints, specify transformative goals, and address methodological shortcomings. For a more comprehensive perspective, I believe they should have included the housing, water management, and public health sectors. They should have additionally identified transformative outcomes and maybe employed additional methodologies such as network analysis or sentiment analysis to supplement the clustering methodology. Or address these as gaps for future studies.
- The article, I believe, should also infer how "Smart" is understood and applied differently across different geographical, cultural, and socio-economic contexts.

The article critically analysed the term "smart" in urban planning across three areas. It identified inadequacies in the present discourse and advocated for a more revolutionary approach. The study recommends that future studies broaden its reach, include practitioner viewpoints, and account for regional and cultural differences. The research lays the groundwork for reconsidering how "smart" is defined and implemented in urban planning, with significant consequences for policy and practice. However, the article's lack of regional context is a key weakness, as seen by the absence of discussion of how "Smart" is defined and used differently across diverse geographical, cultural, and socioeconomic situations. Hence, I request the authors address these minor review comments stated above to further strengthen the commendable effort in furthering the field of discussion in the field.

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Yes, very few.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes, very clear

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Presentation of the correlation tables is not very reader-friendly. It adds very little value to the paper in its current version. I am unable to comment on a better way to present it. But I feel reconsideration would be nice.

Limitations of the study are presented in the discussion of the paper. Better to move that to the section of research methods.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The alphabetical order of author surnames has not been adhered to in some in-text citations.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
