

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

Alexandru-Ionut Petrisor<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ion Mincu University of Architecture and Urbanism

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The importance of studying the urban green infrastructure can be summarized as follows (Petrișoret *al.*, 2016, 2021, 2022): a well-planned and spatially continuous urban green infrastructure provides more and diverse ecosystem services, increasing urban life quality and sustainability. Poor or no planning turns this circle into a vicious one. However, one of the gaps in studying urban green infrastructure is the accessibility and equity issue (Hadji and Petrișor, 2024), addressed by the article "*Urban Green Infrastructure Planning for the Bangkok Metropolitan Region: An Empirical Study for Greenspace Expansion.*" The study described in the article is aimed at finding the suitability and accessibility for the possible expansion of green space planning in the Bangkok metropolitan region for sustainable urban planning. Although the issue addressed by the study is worth investigating and the article is interesting and could make an important contribution to the field, it requires a revision before being published.

First, although the authors carry out an extensive literature review, and the issue of accessibility and equity in green infrastructure planning is not sufficiently addressed by the literature, the authors do not carry out their literature review in a critical way, identifying the shortcomings (ambiguities, controversies, misconceptions, or lacks) of previous studies, and thus justifying the need for research, emphasizing the novel and original elements of their own study. The introduction must be enriched with at least two paragraphs, one summarizing the shortcomings of previous studies before declaring the research goals, and another one emphasizing the novel and original elements of the current study, in relationship with the existing literature gaps, after declaring the research goals. I also recommend expanding the literature review. The article is not sufficiently anchored in the existing literature, provided that there are only 30 references, but a simple Google Scholar search on "Urban Green Infrastructure Planning" yields over 2 million results. Broadening the horizon will help the authors be more critical in reviewing such a vast literature and emphasizing better the need for research and the novelty and originality of their work.

Figure 1 is produced on the premise that the reader is from Thailand or at least familiar with its geography. This excludes international readers. An article intended for an international audience is not a report for national authorities. The authors should present, using the "map-in-map" system or more maps, an image (or more) showing the location of the study area in an international context, making visible the neighboring countries with their names, so that a researcher from Djibouti, just to randomly pick up an example, could understand the map too.

The most important section of a research article, the “Discussion,” is insufficiently developed. The authors emphasize the importance of research, justifying its publication, by showing the significance of results and their importance; there is also external validation of the results against those of similar studies from other countries, identified in the literature. However, there are some questions that remain unanswered. The authors must discuss the inner validation of results against the study goals or hypotheses and present a summary of the methodological limitations and directions for overcoming them in future research. The first part (inner validation of results) is particularly important because the manuscript presents too many results without a clear indication of their contribution to the overall research goal. Moreover, sometimes the presentation is too technical and lacks the skill of translating figures into ideas, broadening the potential audience; for example (again picked at random), “About 287.84 km<sup>2</sup> (18.20%) and 337.91 km<sup>2</sup> (21.37%) have high to very high potential to ameliorate the green spaces in the metropolitan areas” - is it good? Is it enough? What are the implications? What do these figures say, after all? The authors are advised to reconsider their presentation in this key. A scientific article is not a research report. Its aim is not to present the methodological steps taken and results obtained in their entirety, but it should make a point, and only those results contributing to making that point should be presented and explained in greater detail.

In a nutshell, the introduction and discussions must be revised to increase the research depth, and the article should be rewritten focusing more on delivering ideas than raw results, and rethinking the presentation for a broader international audience.

## References

Hadji M., Petrișor A.-I. (2024), *From agricultural oasis to urbanization: path of oasis green infrastructures in Biskra, Algeria*, Scientific Papers. Series B. Horticulture, *in press*

Petrișor A.-I., Andronache I. C., Petrișor L. E., Ciobotaru A. M., Peptenatu D. (2016), *Assessing the fragmentation of the green infrastructure in Romanian cities using fractal models and numerical taxonomy*, *Procedia Environmental Sciences* 32: 110-123, DOI:10.1016/j.proenv.2016.03.016

Petrișor A.-I., Mierzejewska L., Mitrea A. (2022), *Mechanisms of Change in Urban Green Infrastructure - Evidence from Romania and Poland*, *Land* 11(5): 592, DOI:10.3390/land11050592

Petrișor A.-I., Mierzejewska L., Mitrea A., Drachal K., Tache A. V. (2021), *Dynamics of Open Green Areas in Polish and Romanian Cities During 2006-2018: Insights for Spatial Planners*, *Remote Sensing* 13(20): 4041, DOI:10.3390/rs13204041