

# Review of: "Maintaining Sustainable, Affordable, and Low-Cost Housing for Middle- and Low-Income Classes in Uganda"

Stephan De Beer<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Pretoria

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Maybe I am not familiar with the format or requirements of the specific journal, but I have the following concerns:

1. I am unconvinced that the article, as a research article, presents original material or findings. As someone who has little knowledge of the Ugandan housing sector, much of what is in the article I could have guessed or assumed. By stating that, I do not suggest that the content is not valid, but I am not convinced it states anything new. What is the original or novel contribution of the article?
2. The objective and research question underpinning the article seems to be too broad - wanting to address the whole challenge of affordable housing, in all its facets, for middle- and low-income Ugandans - I would have said that is the policy statement for the government of Uganda. In a research piece like this, I would suggest that, after the broad overview, the author should suggest a number of concerns or factors restricting affordable housing for the author to perhaps hone in on one or two aspects, or make it more focused.
3. In order for the article to be published as an original research article, I would suggest a more focused approach, choosing an aspect of the article and going slightly deeper; for example, in the recommendations, policy reform is mentioned with these three specific mechanisms 'targeted government policies, such as subsidies, incentives for developers, and regulatory reforms' - maybe of more value would have been if the author focused on one aspect such as policy reform, and then unpacked these three mechanisms in more detail to make a novel contribution; this is just an example, because the author could have done the same with energy efficiency or community participation or any of the other elements. As it is, it just feels too generic, as if the author retells what might be common knowledge, without providing an original, innovative, or new contribution which clearly s/he is able to contribute, based on the clear overview of the problem and the understanding of possible interventions.
4. Structure of the article: I propose that the research methodology section be placed much earlier, just after the research objectives. It seems lost where it is placed now. Once one knows what the methodology is, then the other sections start to make more sense. The logical sequence of the article can be improved.
5. Also, the author mentions 'success stories' but then really mentions only ONE case, which is probably not going to be the one-size-fits-all solution for all Ugandan housing problems. I would have expected 3 or 4 short cases that are diverse, to tease out possible lessons for policy, community participation, affordability, energy efficiency, etc.

6. Finally, as in point 4, the structure could be a bit more coherent and tightly packaged.

I would suggest for the author to consider these comments, and once reworked, to resubmit for publication