

Review of: "Examining GITAM (Deemed to be University), Hyderabad Campus for Crime Prevention through Environmental Design Measures: A Foundation Towards a Safe CPTED Exterior Campus Model"

Jasmine Bachtiar¹

¹ Universitas Mataram

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This article bring a really interesting issue because it attempts to evaluate campus area with CPTED theory. It covers a lot of pictures of design standard so i can understand the concept design as a reader. However, there are several details that author should take in consideration:

1. Lack in number of samples. Author only provided 5 respondents to make up the conclusion and recommendation based on CPTED design guideline. On the other hand, there are two kinds of question sets with different sample sizes, 5 and 3 respondents in order. I do not think the recommendation can cover the evaluation of campus design. The author should clarify and identify research variables first before conducting data, and evaluate the design based on variables, then make some recommendation or conclusion. Try to collect some data if the author want to provide people perspectives in this paper.
2. Many complex and long sentences. The sentence in abstract " these are achieved by choising" is too long and not easy to follow. This sentence should be chunked into 2 or 3 sentences to make it clear.
3. Keywords: please make sure that every words are written in abstract, do not use new phrases in keywords.
4. Issues are not clearly stated in introduction. The paper does not highlight the importance of this study although it provides many example of crimes. What is GITAM? What is the urgency needed to evaluate campus design? In introduction, there are lack of references or precedntces to stengthen and support this issue and this topic.
5. Literatures: where did the author find the source of CPTED principles? I love the pictures that are provided by author, but i cannot see the colleration to the recommendation. How does the author claim that the CPTED Design Consideration provided as the design standard?
6. The research location is not clear. The author provided campus plan on figure 35 with the title: unsafe soots marked by the user group. Unfortunately, the figure cannot describe the unsafe spot becuase there are no differences in the provided plan. Is it the black rectangle that considered as unsafe place? If yes, why is it not safe and what are the conditions in each rectangle? The author give a lot of pictures but i cannot locate and imagine where the location of those pictures.
7. Discussion is too short. Please search some realted researches about CPTED, inthink there are a lot of researches out there to support your article/paper.

In summary, please arrange your paper into scientific templates and provide some literature review from published articles. Thank you.