

Review of: "Caution Signages and Their Relevance in Commuter Safety in High-Density Construction and Traffic Areas of Two Smart Cities in Odisha: A Cross-Sectional Study to Ensure Eco-Mobility"

Chukwukasi Wilson Kassy¹

¹ University of Nigeria-Teaching Hospital

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review of: Caution Signages and Their Relevance in Commuter Safety in High-Density Construction and Traffic Areas of Two Smart Cities in Odisha: A Cross-Sectional Study to Ensure Eco-Mobility.

Dr. Kassy Wilson Chukwukasi

Abstract

1. Background: This is too long. The aim in this abstract should be written in prose instead of numbering it.
2. Methods section – This should be in past tense.
3. Conclusion section: This is absent in the abstract.

Materials and methods.

1. The sample size was not well defined to give the readers a knowledge of how the authors arrived at 240. This will be help for reader's reproducibility in another environment.

Methodology

1. The standardized pictorial flow chart by the Disaster Management Board should be referenced appropriately.
2. "Scores on 26 signages were compared against a few prominent socio-demographic variables if identified correctly 1 mark and if not then 0. Thus, the total score was 28." The above statement is not clear, does it mean there are 26 different signages with 28 responses or there is 26 signage questions with query 28 responses. Please rewrite that sentences.
3. The sampling technique to arrive at 240 respondents in sites selected were not clear.

Results

1. In table 1 & 2, the age group 11 – 20, 21 – 50 and > 50 years were mentioned while in the methodology and other places, 11 – 20, 21 – 59 and > 60 years was used. Also that > 60 should read ≥ 60 years.
2. The results section is worded with repetitive phrases and sentences seen in the discussions. The authors should

remove those phrases and sentences from the results section and leave them in the discussion section.

Discussion

1. The referencing style is not consistent. The authors started with Vancouver and moved to Harvard and others. The authors should stick to one referencing style accepted by the journal.

Conclusion

1. The authors mentioned the big cities (urban) and small cities (rural) but in the methodology did not tell the readers which cities are big and small. Also the results did not show the different cities.