Paper: **"Sectoral Interconnectedness: insights from five sectors in 'smart' urban planning (Energy, Transport, Waste Management, Buildings, and Cities)"**

Corresponding Author: Vincent Onyango

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Benedict Okundaye
University of Huddersfield, UK

Reviewer 2: Hussein Sharara
The Lebanese University, Lebanon

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The explicit
title accurately represents the article's emphasis on sectoral interdependence in intelligent urban design. Nonetheless, "insight" may be rendered plural as "insights" for grammatical precision. Incorporating the five sectors in parentheses enhances specificity, effectively aligning with the content.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract briefly describes the research goal (assessing interconnection across five sectors), methodologies (mixed-method analysis using NVivo), and main findings (strong Energy-Transport linkages, poor Waste Management-Buildings integration). However, it might be more succinct, especially when contextualising the situation and its repercussions.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
The article is generally well-written; however, minor grammatical inconsistencies are present—for example, inconsistent capitalisation in terms such as "Smart Transport" versus "smart energy." A thorough proofreading is recommended to resolve occasional redundancy and syntax issues, such as replacing "bereaved of" with the more appropriate "bereft of."

The study METHODS are explained clearly.
The methods are systematically described, including PRISMA-guided literature review, coding procedures, and NVivo-based cluster analysis. However, further details on inclusion/exclusion criteria for document selection and justification for expanding from three to five sectors would enhance clarity. Also, define the correlation thresholds.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
The body is logically structured, with strong alignment between sections. However, minor errors exist and areas need further clarity to improve comprehension. Some tenses are too long i.e., "Interconnectedness, as conceptualized here, involves explicitly analyzing, aligning, and strategically linking the smart elements, i.e., meanings, goals, and applications... between two or more smart sectors"

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The methods are systematically described, including PRISMA-guided literature review, coding procedures, and NVivo-based cluster analysis. However, further details on inclusion/exclusion criteria for document selection and justification for expanding from three to five sectors would enhance clarity.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
No. The omission of Onyango et al., 2025 leaves the reference list incomplete. While additional works from 2024-2025 are included (e.g., Russo, 2025; Han & Kim, 2024), the absence of a commonly referenced source is a significant flaw.

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]
2

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
This paper presents a robust mixed-methods study on sectoral interconnectedness in Smart urban planning. Demonstrating clear strengths in its structured approach, policy relevance, and effective use of visual data representation. However, several key improvements would enhance its rigour and clarity: methodological transparency (defining correlation thresholds and PRISMA criteria explicitly), tighter integration of theoretical frameworks throughout, refined language for consistency (standardising capitalisation and simplifying complex sentences), and rectifying the missing reference. The discussion and conclusion sections particularly require focusing on contrasting operational versus transformative goals and better articulation of the study's limitations, show intergrated link with sustainable Smart Planning Theory. Addressing these aspects – minor presentational tweaks such as abstract subheadings and title formatting – would elevate the paper from strong to exceptional. With these revisions, the research could become a benchmark for cross-sectoral Smart city analysis, offering academic and practical value to urban planning stakeholders. The authors might also subhead the abstract, include the Nvivo coding reliability metrics in the method section, and case studies if possible.

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title effectively conveys the research subject and objectives, but it could be shortened to allow researchers to focus more deeply on specific aspects rather than combining three broad sectors (Energy, Transport, Waste Management).
Additionally, it may be beneficial to narrow the scope further by concentrating on either buildings or cities, as each has distinct contextual and methodological considerations.
Proposed Title:
"Sectoral Integration in Smart Urban Planning: A Case Study on Energy, Transport, and Waste Management in the Built Environment"
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
While the abstract outlines the research objectives and general outcomes, it does not explicitly address the key findings. A more structured and detailed presentation would strengthen its effectiveness.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
While the overall flow is logical, the writing suffers from awkward phrasing and wordiness.
In the other hand several grammatical and phrasing issues are present. Examples:
"Each sector is firstly reviewed separately..." -- "First" is preferred over "firstly."
Misuse of commas and inconsistent article usage: e.g., "the Energy sector" vs. "energy sector".
Some verb tenses and sentence structures are inconsistent.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
The methods section lacks sufficient detail, failing to explain how sector-specific data was gathered, which sources were utilized, or the reasoning behind the research design..
A more detailed explanation of the analytical and statistical methodological tools would have been beneficial
This is due to the multiplicity of sectors included in the title and the lack of specification of a sector for detailed study.
A case study would have solved this problem.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
The Body of the paper is clear,
Several errors have been identified in the sections mentioned above.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The conclusion effectively restates the study's objectives and key findings, emphasizing the need for integrated governance and improved coordination. However, while consistent with the research aims,
it falls short of offering concrete policy recommendations or delineating precise avenues for future investigation.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
The references are relevant and appropriate, but limited in scope and currency. Several key works in urban systems theory, complexity science, and cross-sector governance are absent.
Recommended additions could include:

Batty, M. (2013). The New Science of Cities. MIT press
Gehl, J. (2013). Cities for People. Island Press
United Nations reports on urban sustainability (e.g., SDG 11 analysis reports).

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Given the specialized nature of modern research sectors - each with unique urban, social, and technological characteristics - scholars should first analyze sector interconnections and their urban applications before examining individual sectors in depth.
This approach would yield practical frameworks for complex systems, ideally demonstrated through case study in your research.
In the other hand, The systematic application of analytical methods and statistical tools, presented through well-structured tables and graphical representations, significantly strengthened the scientific validity and empirical foundation of this research.