

# Review of: "Young Builders vs. University of Delhi: A case of maintenance of balance between environment and development in housing development for the megacity of Delhi"

Hisham md Sman<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universiti Teknologi Mara

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## ABSTRACT :

1. The beginning of the section requires the researcher to frame the discussion on balancing environment and development. The point of departure could be from the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), New Urban Agenda (NUA), the theoretical debates of the theory of development, or EIA for that matter.
2. The researcher does not state the purpose of the study, research questions (RQs) and research objectives (ROs)
3. The researcher does not highlight the research methodology and data collection techniques, including the document analysis.
4. The results are not clearly described
5. The paper employs no theory
6. The future research and implications are not explained.
7. Explain how the study could be extrapolated to other studies beyond the case study.

## BODY:

1. The introduction should be framed in the context of balancing environment and development. The point of departure could be from the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), New Urban Agenda (NUA), the theoretical debates of the theory of development, or EIA for that matter.
2. Highlight the current deficiency of the study of stress that is unknown or not clearly understood—the need for the study.
3. The author does not introduce the concept of maintenance.
4. The paper flow and explanation are so monotonous.
5. The author offered no theory model to explain the problem of the study.
6. Out of nowhere, the author jumps into the location of the case study (actually, it is not the location of the case study but the case of litigation). The flow is incoherent.
7. Instead of introducing the case of dispute, the author should explain the theoretical debates regarding the focus issue the authors raised.
8. The author's understanding of carrying capacity and its relationship to air is incorrect.
9. After introducing the case study, later the author introduces case analysis, which is Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The author confuses the concept of a case study as advocated by the case study scholars.

10. There is no discussion on the concept of development pressure or any literature review on the EIA or development challenges in India.
11. The discussion of the EIA should introduce the actors involved in the project and their arguments for and against the project.
12. There is no methodological section.
13. The analysis and findings section is too descriptive, dull and monotonous, with no attempt to synthesize and organize according to the thematic analysis.
14. The paper purportedly intends to bring the classical battles of development and environment. In doing so, the paper should introduce the main actors in the study and perform a social network analysis of the narrative for each actor introduced. Unfortunately, this is not the case.
15. The author does not provide arguments for the need for development.
16. The paper demonstrates limited readings on environment and development.
17. Listed in the references but not cited: Dubey, 2019. The national green tribunal in Indian perspective. *Forensic Res. Criminol. Int. J.* Volume 7. <https://doi.org/10.15406/frcij.2019.07.00290>