

Review of: "Safe City Concept in Smart City Planning"

R.A. Turvey¹

¹ Lakehead University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

"Safe City Concept in Smart City Planning"

This paper appears to be relevant to addressing the question of planning and shaping smart, livable cities. However, it needs important additions and revisions to improve its quality before considered for publication.

Introduction:

The introductory section should provide a clear and concise overview of the research problem, objectives and significance if not relevance; along with key definitions of terms such as smart city planning to set out the study context. That is, can a safe city be achieved in the context of framing a smart city; or can a smart city be achieved by developing a safe city? Currently, the introduction is lacking coherence and fails to establish the context of the study. It would be beneficial to reorganize the introduction by adding those aspects mentioned here to give a succinct background on our state of knowledge on the subject. Since there is no proper review of literature, any reader would ask what do we know that this paper will contribute or add to current knowledge? Why is the concept of a safe city needed in smart city planning? Of course, the authors have attempted to establish the links between a safe city and smart city but an overview of the state of knowledge need to be made to justify the need to pay attention to the development of the safe city concept. A literature review usually offers a sufficient grounding of what is already known or not known as found in past studies. The paper simply lacks a comprehensive review of relevant studies and citations- in-text. The definition of safe city does seem to be original but rather a rewording of what a safe city is as defined by the Economic Intelligence Unit. A thorough review will help readers understand the context of the study and the existing knowledge gap that the study aims to address.

Purpose of the study

While the title would let readers expect an enumeration of why and what the objectives or reason for the study, the purpose is missing as it is not clearly stated to make it different from past studies or to fill the knowledge gap on the subject.

Methodology

This paper appears conceptual in approach but the methodology section does not adequately describe how the idea of a safe city is framed. For instance, clearly described if you will carry out a content analysis or use case studies based on certain criteria. The chart as presented can only be useful if there is a textual, systematic and substantive explanation of the steps involved. To any reader, the chart can be interpreted in different or varied ways but the authors must figure out

how they arrive at the concept in the paper. One example would be the use of certain types of security within a city. Consider providing a detailed step-by-step description of the proposed method ie., if making comparative analysis, using case studies, applying content analysis and so on. Whether the chart is self-explanatory or not, I have not encountered a paper that only presents a chart, hence lack description on the methods or techniques data collection and analysis. Since the idea is more towards conceptualization, I would have found a thorough review of literature or some conceptual framework to lead toward framing the concept.

Discussion of Case Studies

This reviewer is unable to evaluate the data enumerated in the case studies not merely due to lack of clarity but because of the inadequacy of information presented. First, much of the content were simple listing of the types of security found in the case study cities to be considered as safe city. Second, how did the authors derived such lists to give a profile of the case studies that would generate a view of a safe city? Third, the case studies lack analysis and citation- in- text of sources for such information applied in the study. Somewhere in the paper, the authors need to pinpoint all sorts of security from digital security to environmental security whether these represented the characteristics of a safe city as conceptualized in the study. In Table 6.1 for comparative analysis, it is interesting to find nothing entered for the row on digital security under each of the case studies, given that the meaning of a safe city is technology driven etc. Risks and threats per case study are mentioned but not on the digital aspect such as identity theft and cybercrime or similar categories. Sadly, there is no documentation, no quantification of any kind that would establish the range and nature of the issues associated with the case study by type of security in the discussion under findings.

Overall Organization, Writing and Content

Overall, the paper lacks adequate discussion of how each aspect from the research problem to the findings are connected to one another if one is to tell a story. Obviously, it deserves thorough editing of the manuscript to improve its quality. In its present form, the reader will find it hard to follow the progression of the way the idea of a safe city is conceptualized. You cannot leave the readers guessing on their own and figuring out the key aspects of your work such as methodology and findings and let them do their own interpretation and analysis. The role of the author as a researcher is to present a well-structured paper, meaning it does not offer a skeletal framework that results to a rather sketchy essay.