

Review of: "Perceptions of 3rd Generation CPTED: Emerging Applications of Technology in Public Space Designs in Smart Cities"

Antonio Clim¹

¹ Academia de Studii Economice din Bucuresti

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Perceptions of 3rd Generation CPTED: Emerging Applications of Technology in Public Space Designs in Smart Cities

FINAL reviewer verdict: REJECTED (or *Suitable with Major Revision*)

Rationale:

1. **Structure and Flow:** The content, though comprehensive, sometimes lacks a cohesive flow, making it challenging for readers to follow seamlessly.
2. **Wordiness:** Several sections are verbose and can be more concise to enhance readability and comprehension.
3. **Redundancy:** There are repetitions in themes and ideas across different sections that could be streamlined for clarity.
4. **Precision and Specificity:** Some arguments and statements in the article are too general and could benefit from being more specific and pointed.
5. **Integration of Technology and Academic Depth:** Given that this is submitted to a high-standard scientific journal for informatics, there could be a deeper dive into the technological intricacies, mathematical foundations, or engineering concepts behind some of the proposals or observations.
6. **Language and Expression:** The language could benefit from polishing to ensure it meets high academic standards consistently across all sections.
7. **Critical Analysis:** Some sections lack critical depth, and by addressing this, the article could offer more value to its readers, especially academic or professional ones.
8. **References and Citations:** It would be beneficial to ensure that all statements, especially those that rely on external sources, are appropriately referenced using the Harvard citation style.

While the topic is timely and relevant, and the article offers valuable insights into the integration of 3rd Generation CPTED in smart city designs, revisions are necessary to elevate the manuscript to meet the expected standards of a top-tier journal like Qeios.

THE REVIEW:

The article TITLE, ABSTRACT & KEYWORDS

Weak Points Identified:

1. **Title Redundancy:** The title contains repetitive themes - both 'public space designs' and 'smart cities' point towards urban environments.
2. **Wordiness:** The abstract is verbose and lacks the precision expected in an abstract.
3. **Abstract Ambiguity:** Certain phrases like "intending to make the lives of citizens better" are too general.
4. **Unstructured Flow:** The order of information presented seems disjointed.
5. **Keyword Redundancy:** "Public space design" and "Smart cities" might be merged for brevity.

Proposed Revision:

Title: *Emerging Technological Applications in 3rd Generation CPTED for Smart Urban Spaces*

Abstract:

"This research delves into the 3rd Generation Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) and its technological integration in modern urban landscapes. As cities evolve into technologically advanced hubs, enhancing citizen well-being and promoting sustainable urban living becomes paramount. This transformation, while promising, confronts challenges, notably data security concerns and the seamless integration of physical devices within urban designs. Through the lens of three case studies — intelligent public lighting, smart surveillance, and interactive digital platforms — this paper addresses these challenges. The objective is twofold: to understand the role of technology in fostering secure urban environments, and to propose an integrative framework of digital security ecosystems. This framework aims to guide municipal decisions in urban architectural and design contexts."

Keywords: 3rd Generation CPTED, Urban Safety, Technological Integration, Digital Security Ecosystem.

1. Introduction

Weak Points Identified:

1. Redundancy: There are repetitive phrases and concepts. For instance, there's an overlap between the general introduction and "Three Generations of CPTED."
2. Ambiguous Terminology: It's unclear what the "defensible space" theory is without further explanation.
3. Logical Flow: The flow from discussing CPTED's historical background to its applications in smart cities could be clearer.
4. Cited references should be better integrated within the narrative for smoother flow.
5. The introductory segment on 1st and 2nd Generation CPTED components is lengthy without a deep dive into the 3rd

Generation.

2. Emergence of 3rd Generation CPTED

Weak Points Identified:

1. **Redundancy:** Certain phrases and references are repetitive.
2. **Ambiguity:** Some sentences are longer and convoluted, making them hard to follow.
3. **Lack of Detail:** The description of the joint project and its significance is insufficient.
4. **Information Organization:** The structuring of facts and key takeaways lacks a clear hierarchy.

3. Smart Cities, CPTED and Tools

Weak Points Identified:

1. **Lengthy Introduction:** The history of smart cities is presented in a lengthy and convoluted manner.
2. **General Statements:** Some statements are broad and could benefit from more specificity.
3. **Organization:** The flow of the section seems disorganized, with information scattered throughout the passage.
4. **List Presentation:** The tools listed could be grouped under broader categories for better clarity.

4. Three Cases of Technology for Security Systems in Smart Cities

Weak Points Identified:

1. **Unclear Emphasis:** The initial section lacks clarity in its main message.
2. **Verbose Phrasing:** Some sentences are wordy and convoluted, which might disrupt the flow for readers.
3. **Incomplete Presentation:** The article mentions three case studies, but doesn't proceed to enumerate or describe them, leaving a gap in the narrative.
4. **Broad Claims:** Statements like "reduce crime significantly" need empirical evidence or specific examples to lend weight to the claims.

4.1. Case 1- Intelligent Lighting Systems

Weak Points Identified:

1. **Introductory Ambiguity:** The significance and role of lighting in urban safety isn't clearly stated.
2. **Unorganized Information Flow:** The text jumps from general aspects to specific examples without a clear transition.
3. **Overuse of Specifics:** Multiple specific cases without thorough explanations can be confusing for the reader.
4. **Lack of Technical Insight:** The technological specifications and implications of the "intelligent lighting" aren't adequately explained.
5. **Incomplete Citation:** The use of parenthetical references can be cleaner, and the URL should be more efficiently incorporated.
6. **Finished with a figure:** Preferably is to not finish with a table or figure.

4.2. Case 2- Smart Surveillance and Security Systems

Weak Points Identified:

1. **Introductory Ambiguity:** The significance and role of lighting in urban safety isn't clearly stated.
2. **Unorganized Information Flow:** The text jumps from general aspects to specific examples without a clear transition.
3. **Overuse of Specifics:** Multiple specific cases without thorough explanations can be confusing for the reader.
4. **Lack of Technical Insight:** The technological specifications and implications of the "intelligent lighting" aren't adequately explained.
5. **Incomplete Citation:** The use of parenthetical references can be cleaner, and the URL should be more efficiently incorporated.

4.3. Case 3- Signage and Digital Interactive Applications

Weak Points Identified:

1. **Broad Statements without Empirical Evidence:** The initial statement correlating city knowledge with safety is presented without concrete evidence or references.
2. **Jumbled Introduction:** The introduction is a combination of various uses of signage but lacks a coherent flow.
3. **Missing Contextual Information:** The Pavegen example is introduced without clearly establishing its link to digital interactive signage.
4. **Redundant Phrasing:** Descriptions such as "interactive, responsive, interesting, informative" seem excessive.
5. **Finished with a figure:** Preferably is to not finish with a table or figure.

5. Challenges w.r.t Security Systems in Smart Cities

Weak Points Identified:

1. **Ambiguous Opening:** The introduction lists challenges but does not delve into each with precision.
2. **Absence of Concrete Evidence:** Broad generalizations without providing empirical backing.
3. **Repetitive Phrasing:** The list form used is verbose and lacks cohesion.
4. **Unclear Concluding Statement:** The conclusion discusses the adaptability of criminals without providing clear solutions or implications.

6. Proposed Framework of 'Mesh of Digital Security Ecosystem'

Weak Points Identified:

1. **Ambiguous Introduction:** The initial statements do not clearly define the core problem or set the context for the reader.
2. **Undefined Hypothetical Presumption:** The text alludes to a "hypothetical presumption" without defining what that presumption is.

3. **Over-generalized Arguments:** There's a lack of depth in explaining how technology can impact urban design and social ambiance.

4. **Vague References:** The references to the case studies are vague, as is the Baltimore example.

7. Conclusions

Weak Points Identified:

1. **Redundancy and Wordiness:** The conclusion is verbose and lacks succinctness.

2. **Ambiguity:** The relevance of "fast developing 'Smart cities' displaying newer techno-methodologies across global scenarios" is mentioned without clear context.

3. **Lack of Depth:** The research conclusions are presented broadly without delving deeper into the specifics of what was learned from the three case studies.

4. **Unfocused References:** Mentioning the Indian context seems out of place without prior buildup.