Review of: "The Effects of Greenery in Balconies of Apartments on People's Well-Being: Using Virtual Reality"

Rund Hiyasat[1]

1 Zayed University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The topic discussed is indeed an important and relevant topic. The title and abstract reflect the content. However, there are several steps that can be taken to improve the quality of the paper:

- Language editing is highly recommended as there are multiple errors.

- In the Introduction/Literature Review sections, the author might consider relying on multiple sources for information. Although it is common to take a piece of information from one source, it is always a good idea to support it with multiple sources.

- Further identification of the indicators and variables that link the physical environment to mental well-being might be helpful.

- The use of Virtual Reality in such a project is a tool and not a goal; hence, it cannot be considered an importance of the research.

- Restructuring the information might help better understand the research. For instance, the author mentions research about the needs of residents in balconies, but no indication of what the main findings were, or what the needs were. As a result, it is unclear what the proposed designs focused on.

- It would help better understand the research by defining "equal visual quality." What was special/different about each of the designs? And what was the common factor?

- Looking at the demographics of the sample, I can see that the author focused on basic information. However, some other data might have an impact on the sample, such as occupation, number of children, etc.

- Explanation and justification of the results is better presented in the discussion section to allow the results section to focus on the explanation and narration of the findings.

- Further literature review on the definition and indicators and variables affecting well-being in the built environment might clarify some of the findings and help find significant differences in results of experiments in the proposed spaces.

- The discussion needs further explanation of the contradictions and discrepancies between the findings and other studies.

- In the discussion, the author mentions that VR was used as a tool to create more accurate results. This is not exactly accurate, as VR did not produce results, but rather allowed for further testing, which might help identify the best-case scenario.

- Findings do not highlight the significance of the research. The use of VR technology allows for multiple scenario testing, and so, has significant value. One would expect an identification of a certain proposal to show better results, or a certain

view or percentage of greenery. However, the paper does not highlight that.

Conclusion:

Overall, the paper discussed a relevant and important topic. However, to highlight this importance, the author is highly recommended to revisit the structure of the paper and presentation of their methodology and findings. As a result, I would recommend major changes to the paper, as this would help showcase the importance of the topic and relevance to the field.