

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-53737

Date: 11-09-2025

Title: Examining the Accessibility of Sidewalks for Wheelchair Users: The Case of Efeler City (Aydın/Türkiye).

Recommendation:

Accept as it isYES.....

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Tahir Ahmad

Reviewer's Comment for Publication:

This manuscript addresses the important topic of **sidewalk accessibility evaluation** and provides valuable findings on the conditions of boulevards in Aydın Province, Turkey. The use of the **Sidewalk Accessibility Index (SAI)** and service-level categorization offers a systematic assessment approach, which is a strength of the study. The work has clear practical significance for urban planning and inclusivity. However, a few minor technical improvements are recommended to strengthen the scientific rigor of the study:

- Methodology – Variable Justification (Lines 110–150, earlier section not shown here):** While V1–V5 are well defined, the justification for why these five were selected over others should be expanded. Please cite additional methodological references to support the variable selection.
- Statistical Analysis (Lines 33–35, Discussion & Conclusion):** The manuscript mentions ANOVA results showing significant differences among boulevards, but no details (F-value, degrees of freedom, p-value) are presented. It would strengthen the paper to briefly report the test statistics, even in summary form.
- Results – Tables 6 & 7 (Lines 197–270):**
 - In **Table 6**, the SAI values are clearly presented, but consider adding a standard deviation or error measure to reflect data variability.
 - In **Table 7**, “Level of Service” grading is mentioned, but the criteria for assigning service levels (B, C, D) should be briefly explained for clarity.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. **Results Interpretation (Lines 250–268):** The manuscript notes that V5 values (street crossing suitability) are consistently low, but the practical implications (e.g., design deficiencies, policy gaps) could be explained more deeply.
5. **Discussion (Lines 330–360):** While the discussion is relevant, it would benefit from comparing the SAI findings with similar accessibility studies in other regions or countries. This would help contextualize the results globally.
6. **Conclusion (Lines 370–385):** The conclusion appropriately highlights BatıGazi as the best-performing boulevard, but it could be enhanced by explicitly suggesting which interventions (e.g., widening sidewalks, improving crossings, surface quality) are most urgent for Atatürk Boulevard.
7. **References (Lines 400 onward):** The reference list is extensive and current. However, please check consistency in formatting (spacing before years, capitalization of article titles).

Overall

Evaluation:

This is a technically sound and well-prepared manuscript with significant practical implications for accessibility studies. With minor revisions, particularly reporting more statistical detail and elaborating on methodological justifications, it will make a valuable contribution to the literature on urban accessibility.