

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

Darryl N. Jones¹

¹ Griffith University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This study makes an important and timely contribution to urban planning, especially in a regional context. The importance of green space and increasing it in urban areas is now acknowledged around the world. It could hardly be more serious than in the large cities of South East Asia. This work will be of enormous value to the planners of Bangkok and other big cities in the region that face similar challenges.

I was extremely impressed by the quality of many of the visualisations, which made it clearer to follow geographically. The analyses were extremely detailed and conveyed an almost overwhelming amount of information. Undoubtedly, it is a major challenge to summarise so much data and findings, although the thoroughness will be, hopefully, of considerable value to the people who make the decisions in the real world.

This point emphasises something noted by other reviewers: publishing this long and often technical piece in this forum may do the excellent work a disservice. The lack of coherent and practical outcomes – as opposed to reiterations of the technical results – means that the important main points that are discerned from the analyses are likely to be missed by a typical, well-educated reader. It takes some effort to wade through the dense explanations. I would implore the authors to consider presenting what they consider to be the key findings in a clearer and more manner. At present, these are difficult to extract from all the text.

There are also some fundamental issues that need to be addressed, some minor, some more significant.

First, nowhere (as far as I could discover) were BMA and BMR defined; in fact, they seemed to be used interchangeably throughout.

Second, given the journal, the text is far too long and would benefit from a careful pruning. This could be done by taking a critical look at the considerable amount of repetition evident in the first section; the same points are made several times in successive paragraphs. Even egregiously, a large proportion of the second paragraph of the Discussion is literally word-for-word identical to the text in the preceding paragraph.

I stumbled over the statement made in the description of MBR which stated that the elevation was: “..from a few metres up to 2 metres”...



Finally, if this excellent, important, and timely work is to have a serious impact, it would be extremely important to at least point out the greatest impediments to seeing these wonderful ideas actually used in the real world. We all know what these are, but it would be useful to present them publicly.