

Review of: "[Short Communication] Building Laws and Public Health: An undergraduate elective pedagogy for architecture students sensitising on the role of building practitioners in preventing disease through the built environment."

Stefanie Dens¹

¹ University of Antwerp

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Author,

Thanks for sharing and publishing this experience. Over all I encourage the content of the work you've been carrying out with the architecture students. The content is highly relevant. However, related to the publication itself I have some major comments, listed below. I would also recommend to proof-read the revised manuscript before submitting, for the sake of correcting spelling mistakes, making correct use of capitals and the abbreviation of long sentences which make the text difficult to read.

- Title: is there a way to shorten the title, focusing on the essence of the Short Communication?
- Abstract:
 - line 1 and 2: what is meant with senior classes of bachelor of architecture? In the next line this becomes students of architecture and planning. Can you clarify?
 - Line 5: who is "They"?
 - Line 5: building laws to prevent disease: can you introduce an example?
 - Line 7: what do you mean with class exercises? Can you give an example to clarify here too? Was it a course, a lecture series, a workshop, a design studio or a research course?
 - Last line: what do you mean with "the same" (2x)?
- Background:
 - Wide windows, minimalist design and light and ventilation were not an outcome of sanatoria. Sanatoria were designed to the needs of tuberculosis patients, and modernism could be seen as a design strategy trying to tackle the air-borne diseases.
 - Line that starts with "the above": Public health and the (built) environment have always been linked: even Hippocrates already wrote about it in his 'On airs, waters and places'
 - Line that starts with "to begin with": this is the core of the paper. Very interesting
 - One question though: why bye-laws and not laws?

- “Conjecturally, it may be pondered that mere assumption that people would automatically make houses which are suitable for them in terms of lighting, ventilation and sanitation may not have held true.” – what do you mean here? Maybe rephrase to clarify?
- “creators” – designers: architects and urban designers.
- Agree with the last sentence: it is also very clearly written. In that sense I would rewrite the background section, focusing on the core of the paper
- Course structure
 - Context
 - Over here it is (finally) clear who the students are. Include this in the abstract (see prior comments)
 - The building laws introduced
 - Over here it is (finally) clear what the focus of the elective was. Include this in the abstract (see prior comments)
 - About the course
 - In the table: “the students were asked to visualize epidemics”. Epidemics can not be visualized. You can visualize spatial factors that contribute to the transmission of several air-borne, vector-borne or water-borne diseases.
 - In the table: you can not design for the prevention of a disease, as most of the time diseases do not have a spatial cause. You can however (try to) design for the prevention of transmission...
- The exercises
 - ‘evidence based design interventions’, for what? Can you specify?
 - ‘table 2’: why was it important for you to peer review student work through this platform? I would personally advise to have student work critically revised by colleagues and/or an (inter)national jury at the school. It does not feel very correct to use these open-access platforms for training students how to deal with peer review.
- Discussion and Endnote
 - It is only here that you highlight on the specific building laws. This should come earlier in the text, where you explain the exercises and what the outcome of (or even recommendations based on) these exercises were.