

Review of: "Crime Prevention through Environmental Design — Enhancing Safety and Livability in Maqboolpura, Amritsar: An Adaptive Approach to Crime Prevention in Informal Settlements"

Dhimas Bayu Anindito¹

¹ Universitas Gadjah Mada

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you and it's my pleasure to review your work. While I suggest publication of this article, there are many major points to note and revise. These including:

1. The abstract still need rewrite to enhance the coherence of each sentence.
2. The keywords need to be carefully selected. You can find more frequent keywords.
3. Please note the correct scientific notations (e.g. km²).
4. I think the arguments signifying Maqboolpura's novelty as a study area should be backed by citations.
5. Do not use acronym inappropriately (e.g. w.r.t. in the last paragraph of Introduction section). Also, avoid shortening two words into one as it will obfuscate real word count (e.g. 'is not' instead of 'isn't').
6. Consider use the proofreading service since there are many confusing sentences throughout the article.
7. The literature review should also be backed by relevant and novel studies. While there are many solid arguments in the section, failing to attribute other people's works is considered plagiarism.
8. Too many mispronunciation and mistyping in the article.
9. Generalisation through the use of diagram (e.g. Figure 1) should also be backed by relevant literature.
10. You just do not cite Wikipedia as source in academic writing.
11. In my opinion, graffiti is not a vandalism; it can be considered street art.
12. The Economist Intelligence Unit's (EIU) Global Livability Index should not be solely used as indices and/or matrix can be developed using any indicators. As this is an academic article, the contestation of similar indexes should also be portrayed in the literature review.
13. Rather than listing literature as points, consider make those into paragraphs since it shows that the generalisation or debate between theories have not been done.
14. Section 2.1.4. also needs to be re-written.
15. Figure 6 should be made into graph, not a sketch.
16. Section 2.3. should be 'Summary' instead of 'Conclusion'. Also consider re-write the whole Section 2 since it does not represent the operational framework used in this study.
17. Your citation technique is incorrect. Attribute the idea to their own original maker correctly.

18. The results lack depths and exploration. There are insufficient evidence to support the claims in this section.
19. The conclusion does not answer the research question, nor reflects back to literature framework, novelty, and setbacks.