

Review of: "Safe City Concept in Smart City Planning"

Zvonimir Nevistić¹

1 University of Zagreb

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper represents a current and interesting topic, but it has certain shortcomings that need to be addressed before publication

- The introduction is written quite concisely and should be expanded and a reference to similar research and the theoretical basis of the research with references should be added. It is necessary to explain the work methodology in more detail (descriptions in words). You can separate the methodology into a new chapter and upgrade the introduction with the theoretical background and research motive with references. Add a reading guide at the end of the introduction.
- References are missing throughout the paper, for example, where does the definition of a smart city come from in chapter 3? Key outcomes that define smart cities taken from where?
- The work needs to be restructured and the number of subchapters should be reduced. Condensing smaller sub-sections (especially chapters 4 and 5) into one and simplifying the reading and fluidity of the work. Focus more on research and less on examples.
- Table 6.1. explain in more detail how did you get the results of the analysis, where the indicators were taken from, and what the individual elements within the table mean, describe in detail through the text. The same applies to chapter 7, which should be described in more detail and how the recommendations presented in chapter 8 is driven.
- Improve the conclusion of the paper.

Improve the mentioned elements, in this form the paper is not suitable for publication.

Qeios ID: BR5PT8 · https://doi.org/10.32388/BR5PT8