Review of: "The Impact on People's Well-being of Utilizing Greenery in the Design of High-rise Residential Building Balconies"

Enzo Grossi

Potential competing interests: I confirm no potential competing interests to declare.

I read with interest the paper by Nazif & Yousefi about the effect of greenery on balconies on wellbeing. The paper is sound and well-written. I have no concerns about the statistical analysis, even if it would be interesting to know the amount of effect size registered, since it was the main criterion for sample size definition. From a methodological point of view, it would be interesting to know the real exposure to greenery of the participants in their homes, since this could represent a bias if not taken into account. How many participants have balconies? And in this subgroup, how many have greenery on their balconies? Are there differences in the three groups of randomization? How many of the participants live in homes which match the 3/30/300 rule? By the way, the '3-30-300 rule' is an evidence-based rule proposed by Cecil Konijnendijk, (C.C. Konijnendijk Evidence-based guidelines for greener, healthier, more resilient neighbourhoods: introducing the 3–30–300 rule J. For. Res. (2022), 10.1007/s11676-022-01523), which stipulates that everyone should be able to see at least 3 trees from their home; there should be 30% tree canopy cover in each neighbourhood; and 300 metres should be the maximum distance to the nearest high-quality public green space. Are there differences in compliance with this rule in the three randomized groups?

I would consider these questions as minor issues. If the authors can answer them, the quality of the paper would be improved. If not, they could add these considerations as limitations of the study. If done, the paper can be accepted.