

Review of: "“Understanding how the design of urban areas can negate the anti-social behaviour and criminal activity” - Taking the example of Hyderabad Urban Areas as Case-Studies"

Ana Nadal¹

¹ El Colegio de la Frontera Sur

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear author

The manuscript's topic interesting, but the content and structure of the article don't represent the topic. I encourage you to follow the recommendations of the reviewers and to work hard on a new version of your text. The topic is interesting, but the approach is not adequate.

The study has been examined and the findings are presented below.

The text does not have the characteristics to be considered a scientific article. The text lacks scientific rigor. The author must redesign all the research study and must be based on scientific evidence. Please review scientific publications from high impact journals to learn how a scientific publication is structured.

There are no clear aims of the research. A clear objective is indispensable to obtain a good investigation.

The article is contradictory from the outset, stating " Despite lacking conclusive empirical evidence" in the limitations section of the abstract.

The text lacks the basic sections of a scientific article and mixes information. The structure of the manuscript should include the sections of: Introduction, Methodology, Results, Discussion, and conclusions. The format of the article must be improved. Please review several published scientific articles to become familiar with the structure.

Please improve your English grammar.

The literature presented in the text is insufficient and limited. I recommend you review many scientific publications that will be useful to support your research.

The abstract should be significantly improved.

The text has 24 figures, which is excessive. In addition, the figures do not provide high quality or priority information and their quality should be improved. It is advisable to have fewer figures that provide more clarity and information for your research.

Figures 3.1.a and 3.1.b do not provide relevant information as part of the results. The survey results should be better expressed.

The information presented in the introduction is insufficient and does not provide scientific support to justify the research.

The methodology should be significantly improved. Currently in the text there is no scientific methodology as such, the author only states that he conducted 30 informal surveys with yes or no answers, which is insufficient for a scientific publication. I recommend you review many scientific publications that will be useful to support your research.

Methodology is key in a scientific article since it allows replication of the study, a basic characteristic of science, so it must be described in detail and include all the necessary elements to be able to be replicated. Including the description of the tools, surveys and ways of analyzing the information.

The results lack scientific relevance and are limited. I recommend you review many scientific publications that will be useful to support your research.

The conclusions are irrelevant and lack scientific rigor and should be significantly improved. I recommend you review many scientific publications that will be useful to support your research.

Decision: The manuscript is declined.