

Review:

1. Is this a new and original contribution?
Yes
2. Is the paper sufficiently within the Aims and Scope of Computers & Geosciences?
Yes
 1. Is the Computer Science covered in this paper sufficient sophistication?
Likely
 2. Does the paper cover an area relevant to the Geosciences?
Yes, it covers Geosciences.
3. Paper presentation
 1. Does the title reflect succinctly the contents?
Yes
 2. Are the figures of sufficient quality?
No, some rework should be done
 3. Is the abstract informative?
Abstract is missing
 4. Are the references adequate?
Yes
4. Please rate the quality of the English?
 1. Excellent
 2. Good
 - 3. Adequate**
 4. Poor
 5. Unacceptable
5. Provide one of the following ratings for the paper
 1. Outstanding
 2. Very good
 - 3. Good**
 4. Fair
 5. Poor
6. What do you recommend to the Editor?
 1. Accept
 2. Minor revision
 - 3. Moderate revision**
 4. Major revision
 5. Reject

1. There are no mentions of similar topics covered in Czech republic or Europe. The only resources discussed similar issues in the United States of America. It should be at least stated that there are no resources from Czech republic or Europe. On the other hand, this paper tries to support or disprove the theory about attraction of crime to some locations.
2. The paper is in the scope of Computers & Geosciences. It even presents custom crafted methods for this particular problem. There were some issues concerning suitability of used methods.
3. The title is relevant to the content. The references were relevant to this topic. The main problem seems to be with images, that are of insufficient quality. Also the abstract was missing.
4. Concerning the quality of English, the overall impression of the article was good. The article was readable, but there were a lot of grammar mistakes and imperfections. At least a brief check of native speaker is recommended.
5. The overall rating of paper is Good.
6. The moderate revision is recommended to the Editor, especially in the grammar part and in the selection of methods.

Additional notes:

Tab 1. is unreadable. It should be presented as partial list or change the format to be more readable.

Fig. 1. is also of bad quality. Improvement of the quality or rework is needed.

Missing conclusion at all.