

Review of: "Evaluating the parameter of visibility adopted for CPTED for user safety in public open space of Haat Bazar: Isovist and VGA"

Mohammad Ebrahim Kohansal¹

¹ Shaheed Beheshti University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Since Qeios is an open peer-review platform, I am going to say that I agree with **Karthik Mohan** on that this not a very novel idea in CPTED literature. What special trait or characteristic do the haats have that makes them significantly different from other public open spaces? Did the research produced any interesting finding or result about the haats in comparison to other POS? Answering these questions (or similar questions) may prove helpful in this regard.

Also, I agree with **Guanhua Qu** that the research should be investigated with more rigorous and in-depth quantitative methods.

The two above mentioned are probably the most important issues of this work. This version of the manuscript is somehow too short and lacks enough description and explanation. For example, the Literature Review section is just a summary table. The literature may have been extensively reviewed but the manuscript does not offer any insight on the literature and position of the current research work in the literature landscape. It only summarizes some of the works that have been previously published. I may also add that the conclusion section is somewhat short and does not offer useful insight on the work that has been done.

Then, if I may dig more at the presented manuscript itself, I think the article would improve if the author address some other issues:

1. Some of the vocabulary used in the text are region based and need explanation for international readers (e.g., IPC: Indian Penal Code?). It is also better to use international units and measurements or add their equivalents in the text (e.g., 1 lakh = 100 thousand?)
2. The questionnaire survey results could be discussed further, I'd advise to provide data tables. It would also be better if a sample of the questionnaire was provided.

Furthermore, why was the name of the respondents' asked? Shouldn't they be anonymous, even for the surveyors? Doesn't it make them feel unnecessarily stressed or nervous?

3. Some of the numbers and percentages are exactly the same in the survey results of the two haats, for example:

"They also feel safer during 7 PM in summer (51%) than in winter (49%)"

“In terms of location, people feel most safe in front of the shops (63%) and least safe in voids and toilets (37%)”

“The survey also found that 86.4% of the people have no idea regarding lost/found provision in the haat.”

“The maximum number of people feel most safe at the entrance (67%) and least safe at the end (33%)”

Have the numbers been double-checked? Is there any explanation for this?

Also, what does "maximum number of people" mean in the last quoted statement? It maybe some language error/barrier but the sentence does not convey a proper meaning.

4. The “Recommendation” section is not discussed in-details enough to justify a separate section for it in the structure of the manuscript. I'd advise to merge it into the Conclusion section (The Conclusion section itself is not mature enough too, by the way).

5. Where does the Recommendation to close the rear entrance come from? What is the line of reasoning behind it? The manuscript does not provide any explanation for it.

6. Isn't recommending to increase the number of guards and patrols against the core concept of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design? It may prove a useful recommendation toward increasing the safety of the space but it would not do so based on CPTED concepts.

Hope to see a revision of your manuscript with major improvements soon.