

# Review of: "A Conceptual Review of Discontinuity in Urban Design: The Morphological and Ethical Dimensions"

A Allahham

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## General:

The paper is very broad in its topic and discussions. It lacks a clear focus on the topic. Its overall structure, paragraphs, sections, and transitions between paragraphs are all disorganized. The sequence of ideas is not smooth. Instead of a coherent argument, there is a disorganized collection of ideas from various sources.

The paper lacks originality and is mostly descriptive. It doesn't advance the knowledge in the field. The majority of the concepts covered are taken from other sources.

The author's point of view is unclear. The paper lacks a cohesive structure and reads like a patchwork of other people's thoughts.

Throughout the whole text, the author tackled the concept of discontinuity in a very abstract manner, with no examples or real implications.

The concept of discontinuity and scholars' opinions on it are closely associated with their perception of history. Is history linear, or does it consist of leaps that require discontinuity, or does it repeat itself, representing advancement and evolution? The author didn't tackle this philosophical question and its relationship to the perception of "discontinuity."

The author sometimes used the word "rupture" to denote discontinuity. It is better to be consistent in the terms used.

**Methodology** is missing. The paper is literature-based; however, no clear methodology is included. It seems like a collection of mosaic ideas.

**Writing style:** The flow of text is not smooth. Too much repetition, no clear structure, jumping from one idea to another in the same paragraph and from one paragraph to another. For example, in the first paragraph of the Introduction, line 3-4, which discourse? The sentence is out of context. Paragraph 4, first line: which previous proposals, which discourse?

Arabic words should be written in English letters, in the text and in the references.

Subtitles should be used in every section to organize the flow of text and ideas.

**Abstract** needs to be more concise, to act as an abstract. The main argument and findings should be included.

**Section 1** is very irrelevant. It needs to be totally eliminated; it's out of context.

**Section 2:** the author should clarify what the difference is between discontinuity and evolution. The former holds a negative connotation, whereas the latter holds a positive one.

The text is very fragmented, with no coherence.

Figures 1, 2, and 3 do not add to the paper. It is better to remove them.

**Section 3:** The introduction to this section is very broad; it should be related to Urban design. The examples selected are very random. No clear reasons for including these examples specifically. The example on p. 20 is not about discontinuity as defined in the paper, but it is a design concept within the house. The example needs to be changed.

Section 3.2, parag.1: There is a confusion between contradiction and discontinuity. The discussion is about contradictions in PoMo and not about discontinuity.

P. 20, last paragraph: The author suddenly jumped from the western discontinuity to quoting the Quran (Islamic world). The same appeared on p. 22.

Section 3 should be considerably shortened. Only the last paragraph on p. 22, and the table (p.23), should be included and further discussed.

**Section 4:** Even though the author stated that the topic of discontinuity in architecture and urban design will be covered in this section, it was addressed in a highly abstract way, much like in the previous sections.

Fig. 7: It is not clear how modernity is a combination/synthesis of Medieval irrationality and Renaissance rationality! The figure should be removed; it has no significance to the paper.

p. 26, last paragraph: The author jumped into new concepts: public space, injustice, inequality, .. These ideas are out of context. The paragraph should be deleted.

Fig. 8: The two images are from different cities and civilizations, the one to the left from the USA, whereas the one to the right is an Islamic city. How can one read the discontinuity between the two images?

**Section 4.2** about the Arab-Islamic city: Only two pages are dedicated to this subject. It seems that it is imposed on the paper as it is not convincingly and sufficiently discussed. The standpoints mentioned by the author towards traditional architecture in the Arab world have been stated in many other sources for more than five decades. The idea is very exhausted and consumed. No original addition in this regard.

**In brief:** The paper is not considered a scientific research due to the lack of main scientific research components, mainly an argument and a solid methodology. It is a review paper that sheds light on previous studies of the topic with no addition from the author.