

# Review of: "On the Resilience of Urban Real Estate Development"

Sneha Sharma<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms Universität Bonn

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper exhibits considerable potential for refinement to elevate its scholarly merit. To begin with, enriching the literature review through the inclusion of a wider array of references would enhance the depth and breadth of the subject discourse. Furthermore, employing precise and judicious phrasing throughout the text would amplify clarity and cogency. Additionally, it is important to address existing lacunae in the data or information presented which can be done by incorporating pertinent and substantiating details to strengthen the overall argument. Here are some detailed comments that can help:

**Contextualization of the study:** The time-periods are mentioned in the abstract but more information is needed to contextualize the geographical boundaries of the study. Resilience is a localized process so I suggest the author specifies that the study is in the global North as the text later states. It might help to add a line about the main finding/argument of the paper in the abstract which at the moment does not clearly stand out. For instance, the author states, 'the issues at stake concern density and dispersion...' but rephrasing the sentence using terms like 'argues', and 'investigates' will sharpen the abstract and immediately indicate to the reader about the main takeaway of the paper.

As I understand, the paper builds up on a previous predictive study by the author, and therefore a concise summary of this study should be provided (towards the end of the introduction; it can of course be elaborated later as on page 5/8).

Please add more references in the introduction, particularly where existing debates are mentioned. Please add a paragraph on how the analysis was done and add all the relevant citations.

In terms of research method, more information is needed (approach, which kind of experts were interviewed- why and how) to communicate the scientific grounding of the study.

**Note:** On Page 4/8 please be careful and critical in your use of 'developing countries', the author is using the binary concepts of developed and developing countries uncritically. It reinforces a hierarchical view of global development and implies that countries fall into mutually exclusive categories and that there is a linear trajectory from "developing" to "developed." Such uncritical usage in academic research ignores the diversity and complexities of social, economic, and political realities within and between nations. Please refrain from uncritically reproducing such Eurocentric conceptualizations.

I suggest that the author rethinks the aim of writing this paper, in the given version it seems more like a conclusion chapter

and not so much a critical reflection on a previous study. If the author's idea is to strengthen their predictive study done earlier using case studies then please make the analysis scientifically sound.