Review of: "Urban Green Infrastructure Planning for the Bangkok Metropolitan Region: An Empirical Study for Greenspace Expansion"

A. K.A. Rathi[1]

1 CEPT University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Qeios Urban Reviewer comments

1. Introduction-

This section can be written in a better way by avoiding repetitions and organizing the references. The language can also be improved. That will help to shorten it also.

2. Study area-

- A better figure than Fig. 1, showing the described features, could help the reader understand and visualize the study area better.
- I don't see the area of BMR in the study area description!
- To avoid repetitions, the information given in a Table or a Figure need not be described.

3. The study's objectives and methodology used for the study can be described in a separate section.

4. Is there a better word for "Distance from infrastructures"?

5. Both 3.2.3 and 3.2.5 mention "roads."

Road width is not a criterion?

6. 3.2.10

Size of the water body is not a criterion?

7. 3.2.11

How is the coastline defined? High tide line or Highest high tide line….. ?

8. 3.2.12

How are flooded areas defined?

How are the intertidal areas considered in the study?

9. 4.2

Is coastal vegetation considered for greening the city?

10. For data validation with the help of satellite imageries, was ground truthing also done?

11. Discussion

This section also included a literature search which should be taken under methods. The results should be compared with the findings reported by other researchers and analyzed in this section for confirmation or otherwise with the reported findings. The new findings of this study should be highlighted.

12. Conclusions

This section can be made crisp.