

# Review of: "Crime Prevention through Environmental Design in Healthcare Facilities: A study of Sehat Al Sharq at Al Khobar, KSA"

Muhammad Ammad Khan<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> National University of Science and Technology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The authors have undertaken a very good research topic i.e. Crime Prevention through Environmental Design in Healthcare Facilities: A study of Sehat Al Sharq at Al Khobar, KSA. Although, I appreciate their attempt, I found many shortcomings in the manuscript.

1. Abstract should be revised as it lacks required information and consistency. Start with the problem specification (research question) – state the study aim and objectives – describe research approach, methods of data collection, and data analysis (qualitative only) – Major results – Study significance.
2. Introduction section needs restructuring as well as more information on unsafe hospital environments by stating statistical findings of the published reports and academic studies. This will help in conceptualizing the topic understudy and building the rationale.
3. I suggest that the theory should be discussed with the literature review as it will help in creating theoretical framework. Moreover, authors should also clearly describe the variables of the study in this part.
4. A clear problem statement, study aim, and significance is missing which is highly required before jumping to the Research Methodology section.
5. The authors have mentioned mixed-methods approach but did not explain the quantitative methodology. The authors should know it that they have utilized qualitative research methodology which is correct indeed. However, more details are required for data collection method and analysis. Referring Ahmad S. et al, (2022) would be invalid in this case as authors' own findings are required. Moreover, I didn't see any ethical considerations which are highly concerning in this study. If authors fail to explain, their study may have chance to be declined.
6. Results are presented but not explained and cross-compared with other studies. Conclusion before the Results and Discussion is inappropriate. Results and Discussion should be written together. Discussion should be extended and well-written. After that, re-write the conclusion (should be data driven) and recommendations at the end.
7. In many places proper references are required.
8. English should be improved throughout as there are several grammatical mistakes. Overall, my comment is to decline the manuscript as it has major flaws.

