

Review of: "The Impact of Urban Design in minimizing Women's Fear of Crime"

Tilahun Mulatu

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper presents an interesting information, poised to become a compelling publication. To begin with, the author delves into a crucial subject matter: the vulnerability of women to crime in public spaces, a topic deserving of heightened attention. Furthermore, the paper promptly outlines its primary objective, which is to elucidate the influence of urban design on women's fear of crime. However, to enhance its clarity, the paper could benefit from the following suggestions.

To begin, the title lacks the necessary specificity to encapsulate the content within. It can be rephrased as "The impact of public space design in minimizing Woman's fear of crime".

Furthermore, it is advisable for the paper to establish its research questions prior to delving into the literature review. While the author does outline their objectives, it would be beneficial to explicitly state the specific questions (preferably 2-3) that the study intends to address.

The literature review can be improved significantly. First, the literature review meant to be a deep review of prior studies, but it does not seem to be the case for this paper as it comes with very few citations. Four articles for literature review seems to be very small and there is no clear information how the author selected these four articles. Is it a random selection or some other method employed to select the four/five articles listed in table 2.1.

Additionally, the few theories mentioned in the literature review, e.g. Situation Crime Prevention (SCP), Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED), are not discussed in the discussion section. If the author do not related this theories with its findings, why mentioning these theories in the first place?

The method section is relatively clearer except its use of jargon like "positivist technique". What does positivist technique constitutes? Moreover, the same section indicated that the data was collected from several cities in India but what were the reason for selecting these cities – are these cities share common characters pertinent to the objective of the paper?

The methods section also lacks details on data collection (day, month, and year of data collection) and how the online survey was administered and how many participants were participated, and the non-response rate was not reported by the paper. Plus, information on what type of public spaces sampled and the criteria used to select these public spaces is missing.

A good chunk of the first paragraph of the result and discussion section belong to the methods sections. Result and Discussion section should only expound on the findings, not on methods employed to get the findings. Plus, the author didn't discuss the findings in light of pre-existing knowledge (theory). There is no any mention of findings form other

researches (citations) in the result and discussion section that either supported or refuted current findings.