

# Review of: "Evaluating the parameter of visibility adopted for CPTED for user safety in public open space of Haat Bazar: Isovist and VGA"

Kshama Gupta

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

**The paper is interesting and try to address one important aspect of urban design. However, results are not well analyzed and introduction do not define the research gap and novelty of the study. Requires significant modifications for improving the manuscript.**

## Abstract

Define CPTED.

## Introduction

Objective 1 and 2 is implicit in Objective 3 and 4 so objective 1 and 2 is not needed.

Writing of the paper is more in report style. Introduction should outline need of the study and research gaps.

Sample size is just 2.5% of average footfall not 5%.

Legend, north arrow in figures is missing.

Too many figures. Both study sites figures should be merged thematically and results of both sites should be compared as well as the results of questionnaire survey should be linked with VGA analysis.

Findings are not based on VGA analysis which is one of the main objectives of the study.

Comparative analysis of both sites is not performed well.

Results of Likert analysis not presented. Insufficient statistical analysis of survey data.

Presentation of results with strong analysis is missing.