

Reviewer 1

Reviewer comment - 1

The aim of this study was to assess stress level in different color environments using HRV analysis in men and women. The authors continue to study stress levels in colorful environments. The article has a practical meaning. However, it has serious flaws in methodology. The manuscript has low integrity. The purpose of study (lines 134-138) is unclear. Poor English makes it difficult to read and understand the text. The style and grammar need careful editing.

→ Since English is not my native language, I do acknowledge the awkwardness presented in the English grammar and style. I have reflected the review opinion and conducted an overall English proofreading with the help of an expert. Nevertheless, should you identify any sentences that may require further revisions, I will reflect your suggestions in further revisions.

→ The research purpose was revised so that it could be written more clearly. (p.3, line 103-114)

Reviewer comment - 2

Authors should more clearly formulate the purpose of study. The Methodology section needs to be improved. Subjects characteristics, study groups, tests points, output measurements (methods of stress level assessment and ECG registration, HRV analysis), and plan of statistical analysis should be more clearly presented.

→ I have revised the content of '2. Methods' section for better and more clear presentation. (p.3-9, entire)

Reviewer comment - 3

Paragraph 2.6. HRV measurement environment contains the information about configuration of experimental colors (lines 318-335), that could be placed to paragraph 2.1. Lines 336-346 could be placed to paragraph 2.3.

→ Since the content in lines 336–346 is judged to be associated with Paragraph 2.3, it has been rearranged to reflect the review opinion. (p.6-7, line 224-236)

→ The content in lines 318–335 is partially related to the content of '2.1. Configuration of Experiment Colors.' However, our research team left the arrangement as is because we determined that the relevant content is more associated with '2.6. HRV Measurement Environment.' Thus, we hope for the reviewer's understanding and agreement concerning this.

Reviewer comment - 4

The results of HRV in Table 6 are presented without units of measurement. What do numbers like “7.81(0.95)” mean?

→ It means the average value (standard deviation) of $\ln(LF)$, $\ln(HF)$, and RMSSD. The basic unit of $\ln(LF)$ and $\ln(HF)$ is ms^2 , and the basic unit of RMSSD is ms. The relevant content was indicated in Table 7 to reflect the review opinion. (p.9, line 310-311)

Reviewer comment - 5

Authors should use unified terms for sex/genders groups: “male-female” or “man-woman”.

→ To reflect the review opinion, the term was unified as male–female.

Reviewer comment - 6

The abbreviation of the OECD has not been explained.

→ To reflect the review opinion, the explanation of abbreviations was added. (p.1, line 38)

Reviewer comment - 7

The study has complicated design. The results should be presented more clearly for a better understanding of the main results of the study. My conclusion, the article could not be published as it has serious flaws in methodology, additional experiments needed, research not conducted correctly.

→ Thanks to your review comments, we think the current paper is becoming more clear. Our research team strove to reflect your review opinions as much as possible. Despite this, in the event that there are serious errors, we would appreciate it if you could identify them more specifically.

→ According to the review comments, the limitation paragraph has been added to include the limitations of this study.

Thank you again for your careful evaluation.