

Review of: "Analysing the conglomeration of various urban pockets through the lens of environmental design for crime prevention: A case of Kolkata"

Tanmoy Basu

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Title of the paper: Analysing the conglomeration of various urban pockets through the lens of environmental design for crime prevention: A case of Kolkata

Firstly, I am greatly obliged to the Editorial Board of the Journal for inviting me to review the abovementioned paper. The issue discussed in the paper is contemporary, scientific, and relevant for the researchers and policymakers. However, there are some issues in the organizational framework and detailing. Here, I am suggesting relevant comments regarding major revisions of the paper for its further development. The reviewer also declares no potential conflict of interest. Thank you.

Comments and Suggestions

1. The title of the paper is complicated. It is hard to understand at a glance what the authors want to say about the discussion of the topic. Please make a lucid title of the manuscript for the readers.
2. The abstract is too lengthy. Need to concise the abstract with the following points (Authors need not mention the points but it is required to mention the sentences sequentially by the points)-Conceptualization of the Issue-Objectives-Methodology-Major findings-Conclusion/Suggestions. Please also follow the journal guidelines.
3. Keywords should be 5-7. Follow the journal guidelines.
4. The introduction section is too short. Briefly describe the introduction of the terminologies mentioned in the title of the paper in an organized way like- Conglomeration, urban pockets, environmental design, and crime prevention. Include conceptualization of the issue and background of the study.
5. Authors can incorporate the literature review with the introduction section. It should be contemporary. The research gap needs to be mentioned concisely at the end of the literature review.
6. Are there any research questions associated with the formulation of the objectives? Mention the research questions.
7. There are some issues with the citations. These are not homogeneously mentioned throughout the manuscript. As an example first citation in the introduction section is Shaw Clifford R, 1931; the second citation is Bruce L. Benson, 2010; but the third citation is M.Hedayati Marzbali, 2012. In the methodology section, the first citation is Saha, 2021. The citation style is not the same. Moreover, some of the citations are written without the year of the publication such as Wilson and Doenges (the second citation in the methodology section). Authors must follow a single citation style throughout the manuscript based on the journal guidelines.

8. The explanation of the quoted words and the quoted sentences with proper citation (with page number if there is any) is required to be mentioned.
9. There is no proper description of the identity of the KMC, the study area. The geographical identity and the issue-oriented selection criteria of the study area need to be incorporated into the methodology section.
10. Sources of the data and study design should be added in the methodology section.
11. The Authors have mentioned three cites and their selection criteria. A separate table should be arrayed to mention the causes of the selection of such criteria with proper sources/citations/literature.
12. The primary survey technique elaborated in the paper needs to be revised. Justify the sample size with the Census data or other secondary data of 2011 onwards.
13. There should be a separate paragraph in the methodology section that explains the Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Model Validation techniques mentioning the previous studies on the issue of the research.
14. If possible formulate a single diagram of the methodological framework. Whether the authors justified the Likert Scale type questionnaire with validation techniques. Analytical results of the questionnaire validation, data validity method, normality test, and homogeneity test need to be incorporated in the results section. Also, mention the significance value of the Cohrnbatch Alpha.
15. Is there any established relationship among the CPTED Dimension (along with their criteria)? If possible run the regression model and validation.
16. The discussion is too short. The results and discussion seem to be just a details description of the results of the statistical analysis. Separate the discussion section from the results.
17. Include Figures 3-6 in the discussion section of the conclusion and briefly mention the discussion of each of the results comparing with the scenarios of the study area.
18. The conclusion section should be more concise and a true reflection of the results and discussion. Mention the suggestions and future research at the end of the conclusion in an integrative way.
19. Lastly, the authors should also check all the references (following the citations with the journal guidelines), table and figures/photograph sources (where applicable) abbreviations, conversion units, grammar, spelling, and sentence constructions minutely.