CrimRxiv •

Review 3 of "Do Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Strategies Deter Taggers? Voices from the Street"

Auzeem Shariati

Published on: Oct 03, 2021

DOI: 10.21428/cb6ab371.c6e726b6

License: [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC-BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Vote: Publish pending minor changes

[For votes to count, referees must reasonably explain why they voted as they did. Thus, please explain your vote. If you voted to publish pending minor changes, specify each change, why it is needed, and, possibly, how it should/could be done.]

In page 3 (paragraph 2), authors state that “CPTED theory attempts to deter individuals in a more multi-disciplinary approach that looks to make changes on behavioral, social, political, biological, psychological, and the physical environments (Cozens & Love, 2015). I don’t agree that CPTED can change biological and political environments! It can rather improve the physical and social conditions of the environment and this, in turn, create a safer environment. It seems like authors misunderstood Cozens and Love’s article. I encourage them to review the article and see page 394, where Cozen & Love discuss Jeffery’s arguments about a holistic view of correlates of crime.

The review of literature on CPTED (page 5-7) starts with a historical overview and cites a number of studies that acknowledge the importance of CPTED in crime reduction. However, they don’t say much about what we know about the effectiveness of CPTED in reducing crime. I encourage authors to expand this section and report what is known about how CPTED works, and to what extent it has been effective.

Authors stated that “this study will investigate the data through the lens of the original CPTED theory as offered by Jeffery” and then list four CPTED strategies: natural surveillance, territoriality, activity support, and access control. I don’t agree that this is the original (first generation) CPTED. The first generation CPTED was focused on the physical design. So, activity support which “seeks to promote the intended use of the area through encouraging the presence of legitimate users” is a second-generation addition to the CPTED theory. I would suggest that authors revise their language here and don’t present this framework as the original CPTED.

Wording:

- In page 3 (paragraph 1), “key principal conditions” seems redundant.
- In page 5, theories that highlight physical design encompass six theories (redundant). Maybe you can say these theories fall into five main categories.
- In page 5, where authors say “CPTED was originally written by Jeffery”, I would suggest that you rephrase and say “CPTED was coined by Jeffery” because the concept was first written and discussed by Jane Jacobs and Jeffery coined the term CPTED.

- There' s a typo in page 21, target section should be changed to target selection.