

Review of: "CPTED for a Safe Basti: A Case of Nardan Camp"

Abdon Dantas¹

¹ Universidade de Lisboa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article could have good potential but as it is at the moment it is more like an university assignment. It only superficially demonstrate the application of a planning methodology. A good paper would describe the application of the methodology (CPTED), and elaborate on the results, describing what worked and what could be improved, even if it was only one of the strategies delineated. An alternative would be to describe an example of the application of the CPTED methodology to another case study and elaborate on what could be implemented in this case study.

The title is not clear as most people don't know what CPTED or Basti is. A suggestion for a more catchy title would be 'Applying Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) to improve safety: A case study of Nardan Camp'

Sometimes the text refers to Nardan Camp, other times to Nardan Basti. It is important to explain what is a Basti.

The keywords could be improved including words such as 'public space' and 'spatial intervention'.

The author refers to unauthorized settlement. It would be more appropriate to refer as unplanned or informal settlements.

There is a lot of repetition in the text on explanation of increase in criminality. The same information is in the abstract, introduction and Discussion.

The aim of a research paper is not 'to create safe public spaces'. This may be the aim of the implementation of the CPTED method. The aim of the paper should be to demonstrate how the CPTED can provide solutions to tackle the increase in crimes in Nardan, or how the community can contribute to adapt the CPTED method to their reality.

When referring the the NGO in the me methodology, the author should specify the NBO. The secondary research includes 'review' of reports and 'analysis' of CPTED methods.

In the latest version of the paper the section 2. Methodology comes before the section 1.2. This needs to be corrected.

The literature review is very limited. The author should include references to other works that elaborate on the use of planning to improve safety and any other example of the application of the CPTED method.

The figures 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, and 21 do not bring any contribution to the article and should be removed. There is no reference to the other figures in the text.

The proposed interventions require a substantial amount of funds. The ideal would be for the focus group to have

discussed how the community could make some of the improvement themselves; what strategy could be used to persuade the settlers to work together to change the environment themselves.

There are many easy ways (some of them mentioned above) that can improve the article substantially. It may still not be deemed worth publication in a scientific journal but can attract the interest of other researchers.