

# Review of: "A Conceptual Review of Discontinuity in Urban Design: The Morphological and Ethical Dimensions"

Nacima Baron<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ecole Nationale des Ponts et Chausees

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Author,

I have read carefully and taken interest in your text. Here are some reflections with which you can - or cannot - consider a revision and adaptation of it.

My first remark concerns the nature of the text. I do not think that it is a research article.

- because of the length : It is 140 000 Characters , when a normal paper in social science is about 30 000 characters. So you have the material for multiple articles.
- because of the topic : I suppose it comes from various professional activities (teaching, researching) and has been written after a very long experience in urban design and the time for covering a impressive (and really excessive) amount of theoretical thought in so many dimensions of knowledge.

I suppose it is an interdisciplinary essay and maybe it could be transformed in a small book rather than a text. Yet, I am not very accustomed to such matter. If you wish to develop a published research article from this, I recommend you should change completely the approach and, rather exploring the concept of discontinuity in so many different perspectives, choose a very limited and precise question with which you could develop a demonstration thanks to all your culture. As I would recommend to completely reverse the order and begin by the end (your section 4): what is the connection between discontinuity and arab - islamic city and why you can shed a new light in this aspect

The introduction is one of the weakest points of your text because your evocation of discontinuity in urban design is short, highly ambiguous, and the problematic you develop unsufficiently exposed.

I think that in the first section, you jump in the normative trap of the term discontinuity as you draw positive and negative aspects rather than showing the co-extensivity of the descriptive and normative aspects of the term.

In the second section, I have the impression of reading a sort of classical book of urban design and have nothing to reproach. Purely factual. Ending with a critic of zoning. Already known by many researchers.

In the third section, your dualist and manicheist approach comes back in the ethical and unethical representations of discontinuity in urban landscape. I don't say that (fig 6) Sao Paulo or any other place in the world is not discontinuous.

Sao Paulo is an unequal society governed by capitalist system, but capitalism is unethical, not discontinuity.

Section 4 is, I think your main contribution to all the stuff. That is why I insist that you should begin with it and put forward the reasons for which you defend arabic-islamic approach of discontinuity in a kind of a decolonial approach of urban design.

Sincerely Yours