

# Review of: "Building Urban Resilience through Mega-Events: A Systematic Review using Text Mining and Natural Language Processing (NLP)"

Sandrine Simon<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidade Lusófona de Humanidades e Tecnologias

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Some terms used could be changed and/or clarified: e.g., 'post-event usage debates'; *explode* economic impacts' : these are not clear/ correct terms to be used.

Need more explanation on 'passing from 2500 articles to 11' early on in the article. (Which keywords were used to narrow down the search, for instance?)

This article deals with a very interesting theme but is puzzling - mainly because, in my view, it doesn't formulate its objective very clearly. Below, I have gathered various remarks/ suggestions. I think it needs re-working/ organising. I hope my suggestions are helpful! All the best.

Detailed and more general comments:

Some definitions of resilience and mega-event would have been useful earlier on in the article.

Links between urban mega-events and urban planning/ strategies? Why not look at the synergies and trade-offs between urban mega-events and the design of urban planning?

"Through a detailed analysis of mega-events...": do you really give a detailed and illustrated example that you analyse?

Are you really 'providing urban planners, policy-makers, and stakeholders with a comprehensive knowledge and practical insights to make informed decisions related to sustainable development and transformative urbanism'? I think this is not really the case, especially because, when it comes to resilience, one is facing a situation of **unexpected risks/ crisis** that the original system (urban or not) deals with and survives... there is therefore an element of dealing with **surprise and uncertainty** that you do not seem to address at all here. I think it is rather crucial in the context of this debate.

You mention using a 'vast pod of literature and case studies'... which seems paradoxical after explaining that you reduced the sample to 11 articles...? It is not clear at all how you decided to select these 11 articles – on which basis?

In paragraph 2.1 (but it is also true of graphs, tables – general illustration - presented later) **you need to introduce your illustrative material better in your text.** In numerous instances, graphs, tables, etc., are presented without prior introduction and explanation of what you are trying to find out and of how the 'analysis' is 'feeding the narrative' of the

article and the continuity of your research. + Why use a **dendrogram**, **sentiment analysis**, etc.? HOW do these approaches complement and enrich what has been done on these issues? You need to explain this to the reader to establish the relevance of your approach. In the big picture of the article, these various graphs and approaches seem ‘parachuted’ without a particular reason... You need to guide the reader through your methodological approach much better.

“One area receiving particular attention is the significant **economic** implications of mega-events.’ This needs commenting on, discussing, explaining, questioning: urban ‘resilience’ and ‘sustainability’ are precisely more than just about economics and finance. Focusing *solely* on this leads to designing urban planning and strategies that are not resilient because they are ‘off-balance’ – i.e., systematically neglecting the social and ecological dimensions of ‘urban sustainability’!

**Correlation/ causation**; to some extent, linking ‘urban mega events’ and ‘urban resilience’ in terms of correlation/ causation seems rather strange: Resilience is not going to be increased or reduced by mega-events; a city is either resilient or not (thanks to the way in which it is managed/ designed/ i.e., thanks to urban planning and strategies) in the face of ‘unexpected events or crises’. Other factors are going to influence the capacity of urban systems to react to crises – such as mega-events – in a resilient way. The question is: what are these factors? I think the question is therefore not well formulated in this article. Paragraph 3.4.1.: The title is therefore puzzling: it is as if I was asking how the Olympic Games are going to affect the urban resilience of Paris: they are certainly going to *test/ assess* the capacity of Paris as a city to ‘absorb the shock(s) generated by the introduction of such a big event in various ways - in other words, they are going to *test/ assess* the capacity of Paris’ urban planners to make the city resilient. But they are not going to make Paris more or less resilient; it is other factors that are going to make the city more resilient...

So, to some extent, taking mega-events as examples of ‘extra-ordinary shocks’ in the life of a city and observing how the city reacts in its functioning can help in assessing if the way of managing the city has made it resilient or not. And hence, understanding how the city reacted when faced with a mega event can help to draw lessons on how to make it more resilient in the future by identifying what was missing, what went wrong, etc.

Paragraph 4.3 on case studies is interesting – although here again, there is no introductory sentence and presentation of the table)... but ever so SMALL!!

Whilst the formulation of the ‘problematic’ is not correct in many instances in the article, the second paragraph of the Discussion part (last section) is spot on: this is really what you are trying to do, identifying how urban planning, both before the mega-event and during the mega-event, can ensure the resilience of the city as a multi-level and dimensional system (social, economic, and environmental) so that people can benefit from the event, the city survives (and hopefully even benefits from) the event, and the sustainability of the city is altogether enriched.