

Review of: "#CapTheCrossBronx: Grassroots Advocacy & Public Health Research to Secure Federal Funding for Reimagining the Cross Bronx Expressway"

Herman Geyer¹

¹ University of Stellenbosch

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is a great theme for an article. I like the short format and the succinct discussion. The article is also well framed and elaborated, following a logical progression of argumentation. However, this article is missing certain elements required to contribute to the science.

- The abstract is too brief and non-specific. The abstract is facing a grabs the attention of readers, so this is important. An abstract has a specific method with four sections: The research motivation; the problem statement; the research design; the research results. The research motivation is too non-specific and generalised.
- The statement "*the Cross Bronx Expressway forms a scar through the Bronx*" sounds like a tabloid headline. A case can be made using a neutral, distanced but scientifically objective motivation for the research. The motivation is too non-specific and lacking in details.
- No problem statement presented.
- No research designs presented.
- No details given regarding the research results.
- Too much emphasis is given on the Mosesian impacts of the CBE. This must be balanced with and well described detailing of the present-day impacts from the literature.
- Not enough literature employed. Not reading, not informed.
- Since the 2018 AJPH article is of central importance in the article, this article must be discussed in depth, focusing on the problem, impacts and intended benefits.
- Far too little details given on the studio work and its findings. This is a very important aspect of the research.
- The jump to the BIL and its impact on the CBE does not link well to the preceding text. There must be a clear progression in the narrative.
- The argument, specifically the political aspects, is highly partisan. Not a good basis for research. Try motivating the
- RAISE? There is no preceding discussion of the grant, its application and intended purpose.
- What was the results of the interdepartmental feasibility study?
- The use of quotes has an illustrative purpose, and cannot serve as a self-substantiated statement. Use it in context to further the discussion and argument.
- The quotes are also not very useful because there are statements of intent, not a statement of the objective evaluation of the benefits of the intervention. I would select a more representative quotes.

- What was the results of the evaluations and models. These are quite important in designing the intervention.
- Composite caps and electrostatic filtration systems? What are the details? The reader would need more information on these interventions. Sounds like smoke and mirrors, bunny in a hat, tux and tutu. You need to motivate that this is a real solution to a real problem and not just green washing the intervention with no perceptible change in the underlying health problems.
- Motivate how these interventions will mitigate public-health threats and their estimated effectiveness.
- Community inputs are an important aspect of this discussion. More details is needed and how it affected the design of the intervention.
- “The hope is that the process of mitigating the health effects of the CBE will be designed from the ground up to ensure a more sustainable”. You need a little bit more than just hope. Very scientific, super!
- Define how this intervention will be optimally allocated following demographic patterns focusing on the needs of the vulnerable. A very important aspect of the paper.
- Discuss how CBO's and public officials are integrated in every aspect of the intervention.
- How will the deck caps function? What facilities will be provided? How effective will air and noise quality filtration systems be, particularly in reducing asthma, heart disease, lung disease and cancer? No details were given, no intersection with current medical research.
- The conclusions did not state anything specifically. The article can contribute a lot of value but it's just too short and lacking in the research details to provide a useful contribution to the science.