

Review of: "Urban Green Infrastructure Planning for the Bangkok Metropolitan Region: An Empirical Study for Greenspace Expansion"

Sergio Cappucci¹

¹ ENEA

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Urban Green Infrastructure Planning for the Bangkok Metropolitan Region: An Empirical Study for Greenspace is a very interesting paper. I was very excited to read your article. It was very interesting to me, dealing with green infrastructure as part of my research. Nevertheless, I would like to point one way of thinking to you (and your article as well) - new tendencies in landscape design are going in the direction of natural lawns and perennials which have a more natural appearance and have lower maintenance levels. Therefore, education of aesthetic values is crucial (the new paradigm in design goes in the way of finding a new landscape aesthetics in the natural look of space - a representative example is the High Line in New York). So, mowing operational requirements versus new aesthetic tendencies way of thinking needs to be added to your article.

I also suggest considering the case study of Latina and the GreenCAL Tool algorithms, as well as the circular economy implications explained in the manuscript (Cappucci et al., 2022).

From a methodological point of view, it is necessary to explain and introduce all concepts, definitions, and explanations of acronyms used in Tables 1 and 2 before (paragraph 3.1.).

It is not clear what methodology was used for the classification (from Very Low to Very High) reported in Table 5. Can you please explain it better in the text?

Please introduce the BMA explanation in the abstract. In general, I have noticed that there is an intense use of acronyms that are not explicitly introduced or not introduced the first time they are used (see NDBI on page 21/34).

Some minor comments as follows:

Finally, there are problems with references and citations, which are listed as follows:

Page 3: Mokhtarzadeh and Ramachandra 2017 is missing in the ref list

Page 3: Atu and Eja 2013 should be Atu et al. 2013 (see ref list)

Page 27: Zhang et al. 2015 is missing in the ref list

Most/all citations on pages 28-30 are not in the reference list

