# For research article

Manuscript ID: sustainability-2604954

Title: Exploring the Interior Designers' Attitudes toward Sustainable Interior Design Practices: The Case of Jordan

# Response to Reviewer 2 Comments

**1. Summary**

Thank you very much for taking the time to review this manuscript. Please find the detailed responses below and the corresponding revisions/corrections highlighted/in track changes in the re-submitted files.

| **2. Questions for General Evaluation** | **Reviewer's Evaluation** | **Response and Revisions** |
|---|---|---|
| Does the introduction provide sufficient background and include all relevant references? | Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable | |
| Are all the cited references relevant to the research? | Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable | |
| Is the research design appropriate? | Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable | |
| Are the methods adequately described? | Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable | |
| Are the results clearly presented? | Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable | |
| Are the conclusions supported by the results? | Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable | |

**3. Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors**

**Comments 1:** In chapter 2 some concepts are redundant and are repeated, for example: lines 183-185, and lines 188-190. Lines 180-183 and lines 221-224 express a similar concept again. In lines 279, 308, in my opinion, the word "article" should be replaced with the word "paragraph".

**Response 1**: Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we have deleted lines 18-190 to avoid redundancy. We have deleted redundancy in lines 21-24. In addition, the word "article" has been replaced with the word "paragraph" in the lines indicated.

**Comments 2:** In line 493 the "low" value must be changed to 2.09 to meet the threshold of the next value, which starts at 2.10. Please, check if it is a typo or if it is an error that excluded

data.

**Response 2:** Agree. We have, accordingly, changed the low value to 2.09.

**4. Response to Comments on the Quality of English Language**

(x) I am not qualified to assess the quality of English in this paper

( ) English very difficult to understand/incomprehensible

( ) Extensive editing of English language required

( ) Moderate editing of English language required

( ) Minor editing of English language required

( ) English language fine. No issues detected

**Response 1:** N/A

**5. Additional clarifications**

*A copy of the updated manuscript with highlighting on the added section is attached*