

Review of: "Building Design Parameters for the Safety of Individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorder"

Mohamad Nadim Adi¹

¹ Bilkent University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The topic of the paper is important and interesting. However, the lack of clear direction in the paper makes it hard to follow and times the paper reads like an opinion piece rather than a scientific paper, which is disappointing.

Overall:

- Please give more care to the language, it is sometimes hard to follow due o grammatical errors.
- The writing style is hard to follow, please use clearer language.
- It is unclear what the author's contributions are. The recommendations made based on 2 case studies are generic and not well connected to the design scene in India.
- More care should be taken to explain the aim and objectives of this study.
- The Methods used are not justified.
- I believe that this is a missed opportunity as I think the research topic is important to tackle.

Here are comments for each section of the paper:

Abstract:

- Initially while reading the abstract, I was surprised that no references were there. the methodology is not clear in the abstract.

Introduction:

- The first paragraph has a lot for statements that are not referenced, that should be addressed.
- References for the figures should be uniform with the rest of the references in the text.
- The statistics from the world health organization are old (2015 and older) please use more recent statistics.
- Most references used in the risk factors sub-section are old (2001. 2012, and 2013) please use more recent studies.
- I am not sure that having a registry of people with disabilities is the way to go here. please explain how this will benefit people with disabilities and not create more stigma towards them.
- In sub-section 4.2. *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)*, there is a lot of recommendations it is not clear which are from the authors and which are from other research sources.

Materials and methods:

- The correct term is case studies not case examples.
- Why are case studies only from Australia? I understand the initial argument but why did the authors not include other countries from around the globe or examples from India?
- Results should be mentioned in the results section not this section.

Case studies:

- The authors need to justify why they chose the 2 case studies, not having that makes it seem like a random choice.
- What are the authors evaluation of the case studies? they are just listing what other studies have done!
- The 2 examples chosen are vastly different! the authors need to address that.

Results:

- This section is very short, it should be expanded.
- Apart from listing other studies and stating that it is important to adopt measures to help those who live with Autism. It is not clear what scientific contribution is made here. the recommendations are generic at best and I don't see how they are related to India.