

Review of: "Building Design Parameters for the Safety of Individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorder"

Maryam Mahabadi

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review of [Building Design Parameters for the Safety of Individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorder](#)

This is an important topic. The authors highlighted the effects of the building design parameters on the safety of patients with Autism Spectrum Disorder.

1. [Abstract:](#)

It is recommended to have an organized structure to write down the abstract. Jumping between background, methodology, research questions and a few results was noticeable. Also, the results written in this section should be the most significant outcome of the research study. I believe bringing guesses and implications was not helpful.

2. [Introduction:](#)

The first paragraph was "A safe built environment is an outcome of a human-centric building design approach that is not only accessible but inclusive and efficient in multiple respects. Individuals with disabilities face the brunt of fast-paced urbanization, contributing to a significant increase in misconduct towards individuals. Crime and corruption are inevitable in a developing country, especially where there is a lack of strict regulations. A framework to create safe and secure built environments is imperative to establish a sense of relief among individuals who are more prone to be victims of adversities of this nature. In the case of individuals with disabilities, per se, those belonging to the umbrella of neurodiversity, crime comes much later or may be manifested in the form of general misconduct. Individuals with Autism may be considered the weakest in the shadow of crime, in the sense that their general comprehension of the surroundings is only poor and implicates negative nuances on and through their behavioural responses". Almost none of the statements had a proper citation. To add value, we need to cite previous publications, preferably peer-reviewed. In addition, the content of this paragraph seemed to be slightly off-topic, while it is brought to attention that "Individuals with Autism may be considered the weakest in the shadow of crime, in the sense that their general comprehension of the surroundings is only poor and implicates negative nuances on and through their behavioural response", linking different sentences and paragraphs of the introduction looked hard.

It was good to mention that based on what sources the diagnosis of autism Spectrum Disorders was chosen. for instance, it was good to mention it was based on whether ICD-10, DSM V, or any other sources.

3. [Risk factors for individuals with disabilities](#)

I was expected to read a paragraph which was mainly focused on the predisposing factors related to disabled people. However, it was generalized to all people.

4. Crime Prevention through environmental design and the built environment

The statements and facts were general findings. However, it was not possible to link these findings with the research question.

Sections two to four were background I suppose. I believe they were too long. A narrative explanation all properly linked to the research question would be beneficial.

5. Materials and methods

It seems the study was a series. Mentioning it clearly somewhere at the beginning of the methods and materials could clarify the context.

Including the ethical code of the committee of the research and development of the research site could add value to this report.

The source of patient recruitment was unknown.

The sampling method and sample size were unknown.

Bringing a precise list of risk factors measured in this study was preferred.

The inclusion/ exclusion criteria for recruiting the patients were unknown.

The statistical analysis method was not declared. The software used for this analysis was not declared.

One of the factors measured in this study was bullying, while there was no background for choosing this risk factor. It was nice to know how researchers chose this one and left those explained in the background, left behind.

6. Results

The report was unclear. Providing numbers, graphs, tables and evidence, could add to this article.

7. Discussion

It was missed. We need discussion to understand the similarities and differences of the current study with previous publications to find bottlenecks and gaps in the knowledge.