

## Reviewer's Report ISVSej\_10.12.33\_Sab

Author: Please use this number to identify the revision.

**Title of paper:** [Associativity of Spatial Nodes to Healthy Living Environments in Baghdad, Iraq](#)

### Reviewer 1

This paper examines an interesting issue. However, it has some issues.

#### Abstract

An abstract must say what the issue is, how it was investigated and what the conclusions are. This abstract does it reasonably well. However, it is poorly written: separate the three aspects to three paragraphs. Write short meaningful sentences. Don't write aims here in the abstract. Write what the research did. Write in the present tense. Be brief.

#### Paper

1. The introduction must explain the issue, its background and say what the aims and objectives are. Here, the issue is not clear. It is understood that there is an association between spatial nodes and healthy places as mentioned in the title. However, this introduction does not say any of these things but talks about sustainability goals etc. These are completely irrelevant here. Introduction must be completely rewritten. Say what the issue is, its background and what exactly was investigated through research.

There are also no clear aims and objectives. Please provide them. End the introduction with aims and objectives and make the introduction short and clear. Please note that aims are long term, unmeasurable, noble intentions while objectives are short term, measurable immediately achievable tasks.

2. After the introduction, three aspects must be presented with the following sub headings. Theoretical framework, Review of literature and Research methodology.

3. Theoretical framework: This must discuss the ideas of 'healthy environments, spatial nodes and associativity'. This should be done by referring to theoreticians and should not be written by the author expressing personal opinions. None exist. Some of the material in the introduction may be included in this theoretical framework, which should show the theoretical background of this research.

4. Review of literature: Any research paper must present a critical review of previous significant research dealing with the issue: in this case, association that exists between spatial nodes and healthy environments. There are a lot of such research and most major ones must be discussed, particularly those that have dealt with them in relation to Iraq. 12-15 references are needed. Please download the guidelines from the website and follow suit. Just listing or mentioning them is not enough. It should be a 'critical review'. Use the authors voice, by using statements such as 'according to Rappoport (1969) or as Oliver (1989) says.' Currently, there is some review of literature. However, don't refer to studies, or mention names of books and articles. Previous research should be compared and contrasted to establish the status of current knowledge and where the gaps of that knowledge exist. Current review is inadequate and does not do so. The review must be written in the present tense and not in the past tense. This should not be separate descriptions of books and articles too.

Current writing under literature review is very wrong. It is somewhat part of the theoretical framework. However, it also talks about the aims (which should be in the introduction) and introduction to case studies and justification (which should be part of the research methodology. It is all messed up.

The paragraph explaining how this paper is organized and its structure must be removed. There is no need for it.

1-4 paragraphs must be part of the theoretical Framework.

Last paragraph and the three justifications do not belong here. They should be after the research methodology.

5. Afterwards, explain the research methodology adopted. This must be detailed so that another researcher can follow the same procedure to see if they will get the same result. This is reasonably well done although it needs to be more systematic. Don't talk about analysis here. Explain how data was gathered. Who did what when where and how to collect data for each task.

Introduction to the case study must happen at the very beginning. It must also admit that this research employs a case study method. All these other tools are employed within the case study. 'Spatial nodes' investigated must be identified here with justifications. Nothing exists.

Strangely, although the title says associativity to healthy environments, it does not define what a healthy environment is and the study does not look at 'healthy' aspect of the environment. Later, some comments are made. It seems that the research findings are trapped in the language and concepts of the techniques employed such as those under Space syntax etc. For example, there is no relationship being established between 'healthy environments' and depth maps. They are just produced because that is what space syntax produces.

6. Findings are reasonably clear. However, there is no data. Produce data from each of the research techniques mentioned in the research methodology before any analysis: Please acknowledge sources more fully. Making statements without sources makes no sense in research.

8. Conclusions are not properly done; it writes one paragraph in one sentence, now giving a different interpretation to what this research was doing. First, writing such a paragraph with one long sentence is not acceptable. Second, this is not what this paper said it was doing. It was establishing an 'associativity'. That is now lost.

The final conclusion is about a relationship between streets. It says "the main streets of the region and their connections to the peripheral squares of the region provided support and contributed to making the central square of the region enjoy importance and vitality". This is not about healthy environments.

This paper has no focus and does not stay on one line and is going everywhere. Title says one thing, introduction another and the conclusions say yet another. These need to be resolved.

At the end, it should evaluate the research and show its strengths and weaknesses.

9. Please check all the references for compliance with the ISVS e-journal, and completeness. Make sure that all the references listed here are cited in the text and *vice versa*.

- Journal volumes must be just the number. Most page numbers should not have pp in front of them.
- Replace all 'and' with '&'. Remove the comma from the initial before &
- Some references do not have either volume numbers, page numbers or both.
- Books must have the place of publication: the publisher
- Follow the template style

## Reviewer 2

Aspect	1	2	3	4	5
1. The paper investigates a significant issue					√
2. The paper discusses current knowledge adequately	√				
3. The paper has a clear analysis and argument	√				
4. The paper is scientifically sound		√			
5. The paper makes a significant contribution to knowledge			√		

1. Lowest 3. Neutral 5. Highest

## Specific Observations

**Abstract:** poorly written although it does have all the information.

## Introduction

1. Is the issue investigated clearly stated? Nothing at all. It talks about sustainability Development goals etc. but not the real issue in Baghdad.
2. Is the background to this issue clearly explained? No. Nothing written.
3. Are the aims and objectives of the research well stated? There are no aims and objectives.
4. Other observations and comments: The introduction must say what the issue is, what is examined and what the aims and objectives are. This introduction does not do so. It goes on talking about many things which should be elsewhere. End the introduction with aims and objectives.

## Research background

1. Does it have a good review of previous and relevant literature? No, review of literature is wrong. It is mostly theoretical framework.
2. Is the theoretical basis clear? No. there is no theoretical basis at all.
3. Other observations and comments: This paper requires a proper review of literature, and a theoretical framework.

## 4. Research Methodology

1. Has the research employed sound methods? Reasonably clear. Separate the different activities and explain. Case study is a method which should be mentioned. All other techniques are employed within the case study. Say how data was collected: who di what when where and how.
2. Are the details of the research techniques and tools clearly explained? Need to be clarified.
3. Are the details sufficient (case study introductions etc)? reasonable. However, each technique need to be explained in detail separately.
4. Other observations and comments  
It must be systematically explained: each step with details.

## Findings

1. Are the findings clearly presented? Yes, reasonably clear. However, it is written poorly. Not adequate references to where the data came from. Cite the sources: show two things: Spatial nodes and the associativity to healthy environments. This is not clear.
2. Have the sources of data acknowledged? Very few. This is a serious issue in this paper. Although research methodology mentions many techniques, data is not well presented.
3. Are there data resulting from the method explained before? Yes. However, they do not relate to the issue of spatial nodes and healthy environments well. Other observations and comments: Statements in the findings must be acknowledged as to where the information came from.

## Analysis and Conclusion

1. Is there a sound analysis? *Somewhat, but not clear.*
2. Has the analysis led to meaningful conclusions? *Conclusion is poor. It is not about the issue but the relationships between streets.*
3. Do the analysis and the conclusions relate well to the research issues? *Conclusions are confusing. However, the essential issue of the associativity between the spatial nodes and healthy environments is not established conclusively..*
4. Does it have recommendations to address to issue: *There is no evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses.*
5. Other observations and comments: *This paper has formatting issues. Follow the template. Remove the spaces between the paragraphs. Follow the template. References must be according to the template. Remove comma before & and Replace all 'and' with &. Volume numbers and page numbers are needed for the journals.*

## 6. QUALITY ASSESSMENT

**Follows appropriate ethical guidelines:** yes [] no [  
comments:

**Has redundant and / or unnecessary parts:** yes [] no [  
comments:

**Has any lack of argumentation, i.e. some parts could be strengthened such that the paper is anticipated better by the ISVS audience:** Yes [] no [  
comments: *Argument flows reasonably well.*

**Has correct citations using the Harvard style** Yes [] no [  
comments: *yes.*

**Spelling, grammar and the use of the language is satisfactory** Yes [] no [  
comments: *Sometimes very long sentences. Arguments are not clear.*

**The list of references are well composed with correct details** Yes [] no []. *Most of the references need to be revised. Vol. and pp. are missing. Please pay attention to details.*  
comments: *Issues exist. Follow the ISVS e-journal template.*

## Final Decision

1. Accepted [  ]
2. Accepted with minor revisions [  ]
3. Reconsider after major revisions []
4. Rejected [  ]

**Summary of the overall observations of the paper:** *This paper examines an interesting issue of ideological meanings of dance. There is no proper literature review. Theoretical basis is poor. Findings need evidence. Conclusion needs strengthening. Title says 'philosophy of the dance'. However, no such philosophy was revealed. References must be re-checked.*