Review of: "Analysing crimes in public spaces of New Delhi through news reports: The need and possibility of integrating Crime Prevention through Environmental Design Principles."

Tianchen Dai[1]

1 Delft University of Technology

This is a timely and interesting study that explores the need and possibility of integrating Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles into the built environment to reduce crime in New Delhi. This paper certainly contributes to exploring the relationship between urban crime and environmental design. Using a document analysis approach to 100 records of criminal activity from New Delhi's public spaces, the paper highlights that a large number of crimes were either facilitated or influenced by elements of the built environment. In addition to the obvious merits of this study, I would like to point out a few issues to improve the quality and readability of the article:

1. There is some overlapping information in the Introduction, Background, Aim and Objectives, and Need for Study sections. Considering that the Introduction is rather short in length, I recommend authors to merge the above-mentioned 4 sections and streamline where applicable. For instance, the "Need for study" section is about the importance of this study. It is advisable to place this section at the beginning of the "Introduction" section, just before the author introduces the aims and CPTED, to emphasize the importance of addressing these serious social problems.

2. To make the whole article flow logically, "Four Dimensions of CPTED" can be a separate section and can be extended to include more relevant references to make a proper literature review to serve as a theoretical basis for this research.

3. In Figure 1, the relationship between the small blue squares and the "steps", as well as the reading order of this diagram, need to be labelled and explained in detail. Now the figure can be confusing for the reader.

4. In addition, some abbreviations appeared rather abruptly, such as "NRH Police" and "IPC crimes" in the first paragraph, which need to be clarified as to what the full name stands for.

5. In the first paragraph in Methodology, the authors said that these crimes are divided into heinous (rape, murder, kidnapping, etc.) and non-heinous (snatching, etc.). I'm wondering about the reasons for this, as there is no specific analysis based on these two categories in the following analysis process.

6. "According to Delhi Crime Statistic numbers resealed by the Delhi police, the total number of IPC crimes that took place in Delhi between 2017-2023 lies between 15 to 17 lakhs. So, this study with a sample size of 100 has a confidence level of 95% and a 10% margin of error." I don't follow the logic in these two sentences. In my opinion, the calculation process and scientific method behind the "confidence level" and "margin of error" should be explained.

7. It is pertinent to inquire about whether the statement, "44% of incidents can be deterred just by using the principle of

'natural surveillance,'" in the second paragraph of the "Results and Analysis" section is based on the testimony of a criminal or a literature review on the psychology of crime. Furthermore, the authors should have provided a more detailed explanation of the entire process of categorizing the cases. For instance, what information was extracted from the crime records, and how does it align with CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design)? How is it determined that applying CPTED is likely to prevent crime? What criteria or basis are used for making this judgment? Is it solely based on the description of the crime scene? Therefore, it is imperative to include the necessary details to adequately address these issues.

8. Now, the "Discussion" is a bit superficial and "Conclusion" is rather short. I suggest the authors to prolong the "Discussion" thoroughly based on their findings.

9. There are some unusual words in the article that are applicable in the Indian context, for which I think the authors should give some explanations, such as "lakhs" and "chowkis".

10. In the "Conclusion" section, line 5: "...bye laws of various municipalities", "bye" is clearly a typo. Careful proofreading is therefore required to improve the readability of this article.