

Review of: "Natural Surveillance and Natural Access Control: Implementation strategies for enhancing Safety in Indian Neighborhoods"

Elisabetta Mafrolla¹

¹ University of Foggia

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

QUEIOS

TITLE: Natural Surveillance and Natural Access Control: Implementation strategies for enhancing Safety in Indian Neighborhoods

REFEREE'S REPORT

This paper emphasizes the importance of safety and security in Indian neighborhoods. It promises strategies for natural surveillance and natural access control, including clear sightlines, community engagement, and collaboration for safer, thriving communities. Actually, it is only a literature review, hence, little added value for research. Nevertheless, in the aftermath of some adjustments I list below, it could be a sufficient preliminary work of literature review, worth of publication.

MAIN ISSUES:

1. General quality of writing with references: I find the paper not academically rigorous. Basically, all that is written seems elaborated as personal opinions by the authors. E.g. In the introductory section (p.2) the authors support that "Natural surveillance and natural access control are key principles in urban design and crime prevention that focus on shaping the physical environment to deter criminal activity and enhance the safety of neighborhoods. These principles are closely related to Oscar Newman's "defensible space" theory, which emphasizes how the design and layout of urban spaces can influence crime rates and community safety." Although I agree with the authors, they need to support such statements with previous researchers' findings, citing the bibliographical collocation of both the idea that urban design is able to prevent criminality and the Oscar Newman's theory. The reader should be able to find immediately the reference. This comment affects the whole paper and similar concerns raise on every 2-3 lines of this paper. Also, when commenting on chronical, a reference to a reckoned newspaper should be clearly made in the paper.
2. The methodology is described too simplistically: literature review has its own rigorous techniques. Please, have a look to how scholars in political and social sciences describe their method in top ranked journals, and adjust your methodology, its description, and, eventually, also your consequent statements/findings. Moreover, the reference list is difficult to approach by the reader: not in alphabetical order, not numbered... similar concerns with the tables: too

much of narrative in the boxes, too little synthetic or schematic design and report.

3. The authors should clarify both in the title and abstract that this paper is a literature review and comment, and not an empirical analysis. Otherwise, the reader would be disappointed.
4. A literature review covers generally a huge number of papers. Here the authors only consider a small list. Moreover, please clearly support the “why” for this paper. What’s the news compared to the other literature reviews addressing similar topics? E.g., a masterpiece is neither compared nor named by the authors: Cozens, P. M., & Love, T. (2015). A review and current status of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED). *Journal of Planning Literature*, 30(4), 393-412.

At some points it seems that the paper is addressed to an Indian readership. E.g., the beginning of par. 4 says “Nowadays, very often we learn about the accidents happening around us, may be, sometimes [...] about seven months ago, a girl went missing while playing in a Sarasvati puja pandal in front of her house in Muzaffarpur. In another incident, a 5-year-old girl in Kerala is kidnapped from the nearby area of her house and her dead body is found dumped in a sack in a marshy area

nearby.” First “seven months ago” does consider the time of writing, that may be different from the one of getting published, hence, absolute instead of relative time elements are recommended. Moreover, what is “a Sarasvati puja pandal”? and “Muzaffarpur” or “Kerala”? Please, consider that the international reader knows little about India, utmost he/she can collocate geographically Bombay and Calcutta... Please try and make it more easy to get...

MINOR ISSUES:

Please, be careful with the use of acronyms, as the reader may misunderstand their meaning or simply do not understand them. E.g., in the last lines of the abstract, the author says that: “This study contributes to the body of knowledge related to CPTED by shedding light on the employment of its two major strategies”. Frankly speaking, I can’t get the meaning of CPTED. Put the extended word in brackets when using them for the first time, and I would also suggest to avoid acronyms in the abstract.