

# Review of: "Fear Factors in Open Spaces – Children's Perception of Public Open Spaces"

Adriana Sampaio<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Royal Institute of Technology

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

The subject is relevant, however the paper is a bit shallow. My suggestions:

- Specify the reference when using specific data, for instance: "rapid urbanization, where it is presumed that by 2050, almost 66% of the children's population will be found in cities"; "concerns of the parents for their children's outdoor play experience"; "Urban open spaces in current times are challenged by the rapid growth of the city's infrastructure, housing, and various facilities. Open spaces are crucial for the well-being of humankind, especially in an urban context. Moreover, open spaces are important for children." Are these just assumptions? Why did you conclude it?
- It could use some methodology to analyze. It is just randomly chosen to analyze "fear factors associated with open space aspects like design, aesthetics, density, accessibility, traffic". I believe it would be more academic if you chose some author that specify categories, for instance. Or at least explain better why you chose these criteria.
- I personally think that this section shouldn't be in the abstract, I think you can explain it better in the conclusion: "Children indicated various fearing factors like strangers, unclean surroundings, diagrams related to the upkeep of various elements in open spaces. The coding of the diagrams indicated concerns related to safety from crime, injury from harmful elements, wayfinding,". I understand that this is part of the conclusion and it is good to add it in the abstract, however I believe it could be more explained, mentioning that the results conclude that "children seem to be more afraid in situations where..."
- Variation on the writing: You always mention something and add the author at the end of the paragraph. I think you could vary on the way you write, for instance, bring the Author's name before, not use only the parenthesis at the end of the paragraph. Use some "According to Zhang & Li (2012) ..." or "Is a research developed in 2003 by Wooley...". This would make the text more dynamic. (These are just examples).
- Other situation where this does not flow so well: "Social benefits include making friends during outdoor play and learning from peers, which are key takeaways from engaging in open spaces. Applying and developing creative abilities enhances self-esteem, adding to the psychological well-being of the children. Having fear to visit open spaces deprives children of the benefits they gain from visitation. During play, children explore and discover their abilities. The achievements during this process build their confidence, which is necessary for their continuous mental and physical development. It is established that children respond more readily to an enriched environment (Bhan, 2006)." There are a lot of texts and you put an author in the end. Was everything said by the same person? There are a lot of conclusions, I believe it could be better written.
- Why do you mention CPTED? First, you do not even introduce the theme, I believe that if you want to use it, which is

fine, it would be better if you make some kind of introduction and explanation on that, connect with children, explain why it is an important methodology with children. It is a bit random at this point.

- Methodology: I believe you could explain with more details how the methodology was approached. How did you approach the children? Were they in the same area in the city (living, studying)? Where they had the paper and pencil (at school, at home, in a park...)? Was there a patent on the application of methodology? Why did you use this range of age in the interviews? My questions do not need to be answered, the issue is that you could explore better the material you have and also explain better your decisions in the process. One of the ideas of academic research is that the experiment can be recreated by others, so with more details it is easier for other researchers to use the material.
- "Drawing is a valuable representational and meaning-making skill that youngsters can use to express their perspective and is intimately tied to thinking (Brooks & Sorin, 2011). Children's drawings can be subjective and ambiguous to analyze; therefore, Open and Axial Coding and categorization Method assisted in systematically analyzing the data (Norozi & Moen, 2016)." I think this part could go in the beginning of the methodology, this would help you to explain why you used the drawing.
- " It was observed that the timing and location of children's play were limited due to various factors such as natural daylight time or well-lit spaces, crowding, the availability of friends, proximity, cleanliness, safety, and security." This is a bit confusing, how did you draw all these conclusions? How was the observation? You conclude all from the drawings? Did you interview the children? These are things you could add in the methodology.
- "six broad categories were identified as follows" . Maybe the categories could be explained before that, for instance "from the explanations of the children about their drawings, the author identified six categories." The CPTED appears again just as letters, which for me is superficial.
- As you identified six categories, you could develop the results around this... Showing drawings and examples in every category.
- Some parts are too vague. "Since most of the surveyed children reported using parking lots and driveways for their regular outdoor activities, they were at risk from traffic, which was a source of fear for them." What is the percentage?
- Explore more of your material, show some examples: "Both the mobility of vehicles and parked vehicles created scenarios that hindered children's play."
- In general you do not explore the authors so well. I believe you could make a literature review in the beginning, or use more references, theories and authors in the introduction.

What I wrote is mostly my opinion and suggestions, based on other papers I read. This paper is very basic from an academic approach point of view.

The subject is interesting, however in general the paper does not show that it is based on science or previous researches/authors.