

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

Wei Tan<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Slovak Medical University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

- For the Abstract, more info is needed about the participants (targeted population, age) and design employed (not clear what makes the 3 groups distinctive).
- Evidence is needed for the following statements.
  - "Increased subjective well-being correlated with improved sleep quality and decreased blood pressure, so it can be said that subjective well-being affects physical health, mental health, reduces the risk of death and increase better social relations."
  - A number of studies show that higher subjective well-being can increase higher income, and increase productivity and reduce fatigue or stress in work.
- There are occasions whereby the presented literature doesn't seem to be directly related to the scope of the study. For example, the part on 'improvement of temperature', and 'coping with health emergencies'. More details and an explicit connection (to the examined DV) are needed.
- The author will need to expand the breadth and depth of the literature to establish a proper foundation for the hypotheses. Equally important is to discuss the research gaps that lead to the exploration of the current topic. Specifically, the authors should discuss what the existing literature says about the impact of greenery/biophilic design on wellbeing – and what is missing from the existing literature that the current paper is trying to fill in.
- The first objective of this study is vague. It is being phrased like a practical question rather than in the form of a research question.
- All the figures presented should be signposted in the written text. Explanation (of the figures) is needed.
- The word 'case study' was used in the Method section. However, I failed to see how the approach used reflects how a case study (in-depth examination of a particular case) is typically being conducted.
- This is not an experimental study, strictly speaking, as well-being is not directly an outcome of how you manipulate your IV – so the phrase "test the effect of greenery in balcony environments on human well-being." Is not accurate, methodologically.
- Check the name - Kelly j Watson.
- More explanation about the self-designed test is needed – the scale (though can be inferred but not being explained), the scoring, the domains (perhaps being explained but I failed to see a clear distinction between the domains) and the

psychometric assessment (validity and reliability) of the test.

- Effect size should be based on previous research with a similar design, variables and hopefully the same sort of analysis. While the author cited Cohen, there is no information on how (which empirical paper with similar design) the effect size is obtained.
- Can the authors report mean age with SD?
- The following section is without any proper context – “*First, we investigated and grouped the existing balconies in the city. An initial interview was conducted, and the existing damages were identified. Then five balconies were designed based on the needs and preferences of the residents.*” What do the authors mean by “existing balconies”, “city”, ‘damages’, ‘residents’. As this article will be read by a wider group of readers, the author should provide relevant details to the above description.
- Kindly provide a specific description of the procedure involved. While a vague explanation exists in the Research Process part, it’s not clear enough what the participants of each group were told to do. Did the participants view two scenes one after another? Is there any randomization? Do they report how they feel in each scene? Is the self-report being made while they are viewing the scene? Was there any interval between the two scenes?
- The result section is not clear and comprehensive enough to the readers. Based on the earlier description, the participants were assigned to 3 groups. Statistically, one would expect an ANOVA (or any analysis with a similar nature to test a group difference) to be performed. It’s not clear how inferences about “correlation” can be made.
- The Result section is inaccurate and not clear. The author will need to rerun the analysis and rewrite the section. Prior to that, the description of the Method needs to be clear and comprehensive enough to allow the reader to infer what analyses can be run by the author.
- The analyses presented in the Result section should be in line with the hypothesis listed in the Introduction. However, this is not the case for now.
- Assessment towards the discussion cannot be made as the Result section is not clear enough.