



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Public Perceptions of Homelessness Policy: A Narrative Review and Exploratory Survey with Reflections for Fremont, CA”

Submitted: 13 June 2026

Accepted: 26 July 2026

Published: 31 July 2026

Corresponding Author: Grant Yuan

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n19p31

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Bupinder Zutshi
Jawaharlal Nehru University, India

Reviewer 2: Murry Siyasiya
Blantyre International University, Malawi

Reviewer 3: Pierluigi Passaro
University of Bari Aldo Moro, Italy

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are with the publisher, and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: PIERLUIGI PASSARO	
University, Country: University of Bari Aldo Moro, Italy	
Date Manuscript Received: 07.07.26	Date Review Report Submitted: 08.07.26
Manuscript Title: Tackling Homelessness and Public Perceptions: A Narrative Review and Exploratory Survey with Policy Reflections for Fremont	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ESJISSN:1857-7881 (Print) – e ISSN 1857 - 7431	
You agree that 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:	
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.

Questions	Rating Result
-----------	---------------

	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

I would like to congratulate the authors on a well-written, thoroughly researched, and engaging manuscript. The paper addresses a highly relevant topic and provides valuable insights into the field. The methodology is robust, the results are clearly presented, and the conclusions are well-supported by the data. I have only a few minor suggestions to help further improve the clarity of the manuscript before publication.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are with the publisher, and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Murry Siyasiya	
University, Country: Blantyre International University, Malawi	
Date Manuscript Received: 08.07.2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 08.07.2026
Manuscript Title: Tackling Homelessness and Public Perceptions: A Narrative Review and Exploratory Survey with Policy Reflections for Fremont	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0670/26	
You agree that 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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
-----------	---

1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	3
<i>(Objectives, sampling technique, data analysis techniques and findings do not come out very clearly)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Sampling and data analysis techniques are not explained clearly)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(The results do not closely match with questions in the data collection tool. It appears the results were predicted from the findings but the prediction techniques needed to have been clearly explained in the Methodology)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(There is no clear conclusion)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

There is need to reorganize the paper so that objectives, data analysis techniques and conclusions should come out clear.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are with the publisher, and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: BUPINDER ZUTSHI	
University, Country: Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India	
Date Manuscript Received: 9 th July 2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 13 th July 2026.
Manuscript Title: Tackling Homelessness and Public Perceptions: A Narrative Review and Exploratory Survey with Policy Reflections for Fremont	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <i>European Scientific Journal, ESJISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431.</i>	
You agree that 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: 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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
-----------	---

1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.	4
The title is descriptive and accurately represents the paper's three components (narrative review, survey, and Fremont-specific policy reflections). It's a bit long by journal conventions (most prefer ~12–15 words), but it isn't misleading, and the subtitle structure clearly signals scope. Researcher may also consider the following alternative title "Public Perceptions of Homelessness Policy: A Narrative Review and Exploratory Survey with Reflections for Fremont, CA."	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	4
The abstract does contain the three core elements, but unevenly, like objective, methods and results. I would recommend adding few lines on to briefly flag the review, note the exploratory/convenience-sample nature of the survey up front, and include at least one effect size.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Overall, the text is good but are few Table typo mistakes, redundant phrasing, informal word choice.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
This is the weakest section, and I'd flag it for major revision before publication: • Duplicated text error: The "Ethics Statement" and "Statistical Analysis" sections contain identical, verbatim paragraphs — the Statistical Analysis section is clearly missing its actual content (it currently just repeats the ethics/consent text). This needs to be fixed before this paper could go out for review. • Sampling: A convenience sample of 66 respondents recruited through "survey-exchange platforms" is a significant limitation for a study whose title invokes Fremont specifically. The paper is appropriately self-aware about this (calling it an "exploratory pilot"), which is good practice, but reviewers will still weigh this heavily. • No demographics collected — acknowledged as a limitation, which is honest, but it also means the study can't rule out sampling skew, and this should probably be disclosed earlier than the appendix.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The findings are reported with appropriate epistemic caution — the authors explicitly separate statistical significance from effect strength and repeatedly caveat that these are correlational, not causal. That's good methodological hygiene. The Limitations, Implications, and Further Research subsections are well organized, and the author is careful to frame findings as hypothesis-generating rather than conclusive (e.g., explicitly flagging the NIMBY-consistent pattern as needing dedicated follow-up research rather than treating it as confirmed). The Fremont policy section is well-sourced with local government and news citations and appropriately hedges its recommendations given the small, non-representative sample.	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Yes, the four reported relationships are clearly explained and tied back to plausible real-world implications.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Mostly solid APA-style formatting with DOIs, but there are a few citation–reference mismatches that need correcting: • (Henwood et al., 2010) is cited in text but there's no matching 2010 Henwood reference in the list (only a 2011 Padgett et al. paper where Henwood is a co-author). • (Lee et al., 2022) is cited in text, but the reference list has "Lee, Tyler, & Wright (2010)" — a year mismatch (and possibly the wrong paper entirely). • (Rand, 2018) is cited in text, but the reference list entry is "Irving, D. (2018)... RAND Corporation" — the in-text citation should read (Irving, 2018) or the organization should be used consistently as the citation. • A couple of URLs are broken across lines in a way that would make them unclickable/invalid if not repaired during typesetting (e.g., the Redfin and Casey/PBS links). These are the kind of citation errors a copyeditor or reviewer will flag immediately, so I'd fix them before submission.	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Minor revisions required before this paper is ready for journal submission. Revision will strongly enhance the quality of the research paper. The suggestions are the kind of fixable issues a competent revise-and-resubmit round would catch.