



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY
Naglaa Ali Megahed,
Port Said University, Egypt

*CORRESPONDENCE
Yin-Shan Lin,
✉ lilianlin003@163.com

RECEIVED 29 April 2024
ACCEPTED 23 July 2024
PUBLISHED 13 August 2024

CITATION

Wang Y and Lin Y-S (2024), Corrigendum:
Public participation in urban design with
augmented reality technology based on
indicator evaluation.
Front. Virtual Real. 5:1424951.
doi: 10.3389/frvir.2024.1424951

COPYRIGHT

© 2024 Wang and Lin. This is an open-access
article distributed under the terms of the
[Creative Commons Attribution License \(CC BY\)](#).
The use, distribution or reproduction in other
forums is permitted, provided the original
author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are
credited and that the original publication in this
journal is cited, in accordance with accepted
academic practice. No use, distribution or
reproduction is permitted which does not
comply with these terms.

Corrigendum: Public participation in urban design with augmented reality technology based on indicator evaluation

Yuchen Wang and Yin-Shan Lin*

School of Architecture, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI, United States

KEYWORDS

urban design, mobile augmented reality, public participation and evaluation, urban design indicator, interactive operation

A Corrigendum on Public participation in urban design with augmented reality technology based on indicator evaluation

by Wang Y and Lin Y-S (2023). *Front. Virtual Real.* 4:1071355. doi: 10.3389/frvir.2023.1071355

In the published article, there was five errors in **Table 2** as published.

One column header was displayed as “60-plus.” The correct header is “61-plus.”

One number in the row labeled “26–60” “After” in the column named “Median” was displayed as “6.0”. The correct number is “5.5.”

One number in the row labeled “61-plus” “After” in the column named “Median” was displayed as “5.0”. The correct number is “4.0.”

One row header was displayed as “Range.” The correct header is “Interquartile range.”

One row was missed at the end. Please add one additional row labeled “Range” as follows.

The corrected **Table 2** and its caption appear below.

In the published article, there was an error in **Table 5** as published.

All data inside the table originally with superscript “a” are actually with superscript “b”, and data originally with superscript “b” are actually with superscript “a”.

The corrected **Table 5** and its caption appear below.

In the published article, there was an error. The order of the data descriptions does not correspond to their subject.

A correction has been made to **4 Assessment**, **4.2 Results**, Paragraph 2. This sentence previously stated:

“equal to 1.80 and 0.91, 1.36 and 0.60, 2.27 and 0.57, and 1.69 and 0.65”

The corrected sentence appears below:

“equal to 1.36 and 0.60, 2.27 and 0.57, 1.69 and 0.65, 1.80 and 0.91”

In the published article, there was an error. The implication of one sentence is not clear and has repetitive words.

A correction has been made to **4 Assessment**, **4.2 Results**, Paragraph 3. This sentence previously stated:

“For the the number of correct answers in overall situation”

The corrected sentence appears below:

TABLE 2 Descriptive statistics of correct answers in Questionnaire A results.

	Overall		18–25		26–60		61-plus	
	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After
Variance	1.80	0.91	1.36	0.60	2.27	0.57	1.69	0.65
SD	1.34	0.95	1.17	0.77	1.51	0.75	1.30	0.81
Mean	2.6	4.5	3.2	5.0	2.5	5.3	2.3	4.0
Median	2.5	5.0	3.0	5.0	2.5	5.5	2.0	4.0
Mode	3.0	4.0	2.0	5.0	1.0	6.0	1.0	4.0
Quartile (25%)	1.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	1.0	5.0	1.0	4.0
Quartile (75%)	3.3	5.0	4.0	6.0	3.0	6.0	3.0	5.0
Interquartile range	2.3	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.0
Range	6.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	5.0	2.0	5.0	2.0

TABLE 5 Correlation matrix of the questionnaire results.

	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12
S1	1.000											
S2	0.307	1.000										
S3	0.363 ^b	0.360 ^b	1.000									
S4	0.222	0.233	0.390 ^a	1.000								
S5	0.060	0.126	0.310 ^a	0.440	1.000							
S6	0.081 ^b	0.154 ^b	0.064	0.078 ^a	0.258 ^a	1.000						
S7	0.315	0.665	0.580	0.326 ^b	0.233 ^b	0.196	1.000					
S8	0.661	0.367	0.675 ^b	0.332	0.248	0.202 ^b	0.531	1.000				
S9	0.152	0.138	0.400 ^a	0.430	0.286	0.230 ^a	0.202	0.359	1.000			
S10	0.395	0.306	0.364 ^a	0.372	0.501	0.330 ^a	0.286 ^b	0.398	0.374	1.000		
S11	0.337 ^b	0.332 ^b	0.858	0.279 ^a	0.216 ^a	0.188	0.614	0.705	0.331 ^b	0.285 ^a	1.000	
S12	0.708	0.358	0.309 ^b	0.266	0.256	0.177 ^b	0.232	0.549	0.180	0.460	0.271 ^b	1.000

^aCorrelation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

^bCorrelation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

“For the number of correct answers in overall situation before experience”

In the published article, there was an error. The implication of one sentence is not clear.

A correction has been made to **4 Assessment, 4.2 Results, Paragraph 3**. This sentence previously stated:

“For other items, the changes of urban forms in diagrams were difficult to correctly answer since users’ familiarity with concepts of most indicators was low.”

The corrected sentence appears below:

“For other items, correctly answering questions about the changes in urban forms depicted in diagrams was difficult, since users’ familiarity with the concepts of most indicators was low.”

In the published article, there was an error. Two sentences do not correctly describe the data.

A correction has been made to **4 Assessment, 4.2 Results, Paragraph 4**. This sentence previously stated:

“The resultant data after application operation showed a concentrated range of the number of correct answers, from 5.0 to 6.0, representing the overall usability of the platform for each group. The increase of the mean from 2.5 to 5.3 and the median from 2.5 to 5.0 demonstrated that familiarity had the largest improvement among these three groups.”

The corrected sentence appears below:

“The data resulting from their experience showed that the number of correct answers was concentrated within a narrower range, from 4.0 to 6.0. The increase in the mean from 2.5 to 5.3 and in the median from 2.5 to 5.5 demonstrated that familiarity had the largest improvement for this group.”

In the published article, there was an error. A phrase was displayed as “to at enhancing” in one sentence is not correct, so the sentence needs to be adjusted.

A correction has been made to **4 Assessment**, *4.2 Results*, Paragraph 4. This sentence previously stated:

“The relatively higher growth of mean value (2.8, from 2.5 to 5.3) in the 26–60 group than those in other groups demonstrated that the platform was more efficient to at enhancing the familiarity among people at this age.”

The corrected sentence appears below:

“The significantly greater increase in the mean value (an increase of 2.8) among the 26–60 age group, compared to other groups, demonstrates that the platform was more effective at enhancing familiarity with the material for individuals in this age range.”

In the published article, there was an error. A sentence does not correctly describe the data.

A correction has been made to **4 Assessment**, *4.2 Results*, Paragraph 6. This sentence previously stated:

“Since the variance was not large (from 1.67 to 2.11)”

The corrected sentence appears below:

“Since the variance was not large (from 1.51 to 2.35)”

In the published article, there was an error. A sentence does not correctly describe the data.

A correction has been made to **4 Assessment**, *4.2 Results*, Paragraph 6. This sentence previously stated:

“The correlation between S1 and S12 was the highest ($r = 0.708$)”

The corrected sentence appears below:

“The correlation between S1 and S12 was one of the highest ($r = 0.708$)”

In the published article, there was an error in **Table 3** as published.

The caption of this table has a word “The” which is not needed.

The corrected caption of **Table 3** is “Reliability analysis of Questionnaire B results.”

In the published article, there was an error. A data is not correctly described in a sentence.

A correction has been made to **4 Assessment**, *4.2 Results*, Paragraph 9. This sentence previously stated:

“S8 had strong correlation with S1 ($r = 0.661$) and S3 ($r = 0.675$, $p < 0.01$)”

The corrected sentence appears below:

“S8 had strong correlation with S1 ($r = 0.661$) and S3 ($r = 0.675$, $p < 0.05$)”

The authors apologize for these errors and state that this does not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way. The original article has been updated.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.