Review of: "The Relationships Between the Perception of Physical and Economic Risks Measured Within the Road Environment and Within the Digital Environment and the Relationships Between Risk Perceptions Measured in Separate Environments"

Shokhan M. Al-Barzinji[1]

1 University of Anbar, Iraq

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper is a valuable contribution to understanding risk perceptions across physical and digital environments. Its interdisciplinary approach, coupled with robust theoretical grounding, offers meaningful insights into the cognitive mechanisms underlying risk assessment. However, addressing clarity, methodological transparency, and presentation would significantly enhance its impact. The abstract clearly outlines the study's goal: to assess the relationships between risk perceptions in different environments and whether knowledge of risks in one environment is transferable to another. It highlights key findings, such as a relationship between driving and crossing risks, and similarities in perceptions of health and economic risks within specific environments. However, the abstract does not mention the methodology, participant demographics, or statistical approaches, which might limit initial understanding for readers. The introduction effectively provides a context for the research by reviewing prior studies on risk perception across environments like roads, workplaces, and digital domains. It introduces critical concepts such as the potential transfer of knowledge between environments and the idea that environments might be perceived as either interconnected or distinct. The section draws on foundational works (e.g., Perlman et al., Leder et al., and Brewer et al.) to build a strong theoretical basis for the study. However, while the introduction offers depth, it could benefit from a more concise structure to avoid overwhelming readers with excessive detail. A clearer separation of themes (e.g., digital vs. physical environments) might enhance readability. The study's participants were divided into four distinct groups, varying in age and driving experience. However, gender representation and other demographic details (e.g., cultural or regional background) are sparse, limiting the generalizability of the results. The study used a **Risk Perception Questionnaire** tailored for specific environments, leveraging established scales like the DBQ and PBS. This ensures reliability and validity in measurement. Including a 7-point Likert scale allows nuanced responses but might introduce subjectivity. The use of e-questionnaires ensures accessibility but may bias the sample toward tech-savvy individuals. The inclusion of both students and non-students broadens the participant base but could introduce variability in educational and contextual risk perceptions.

Strengths:

1. The study’s multidisciplinary approach bridges physical and digital risk perceptions.

2. Use of robust, established scales adds reliability.

Areas for Improvement

1. The paper could benefit from more concise sections and clearer transitions between ideas.
2. Adding detailed statistical metrics and visual representations of data would enhance interpretability.
3. A discussion on potential biases, such as self-reporting or cultural differences, is essential for a nuanced understanding.