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 4 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: The introduction section is poorly referenced and repeats itself in Section. I would recommend removing the introduction section and including more supportive references in the following section. For example, please include studies and data that support the increased importance of sustainable interior design. I think that sustainable interior design may refer to sustainable building design from the context of this paper.

Response 1: Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we have removed the Introduction section and added more supportive references in the following section.

Comments 2: It would also be helpful to include some examples of sustainable interior design. Lines 62-64 are not particularly useful. They include a wide variety of strategies. A relevant example could be the use of indoor fans that helped to reduce cooling energy

consumption by 32% and maintained high human thermal comfort: Kent et al. Energy savings and thermal comfort in a zero energy office building with fans in Singapore.

Response 2: Thank you for pointing this out. Therefore, we have removed lines 62-64 and replaced it with a paragraph on a relevant example could be the use of indoor fans that helped to reduce cooling energy consumption by 32% and maintained high human thermal comfort: Kent et al.

Comments 3: Lines 73-76 repeat, but in more detail, the paragraph above. It might be worth merging these parts.
Response 3: Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. We have merged the two paragraphs into one.

Comments 4: Lines 152-154: It might be more appropriate to explain the example of the 3Rs by using circular economy.
Response 4: Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Explanation of the 3Rs by using circular economy was provided.

Comments 5: Section 2.2: It might be useful to emphasize whether Jordan or the Jordan BGC recommend any specific local or national standards for sustainability. Jordan GBC mentions LEED and BREEAM, which are likely the international versions of these certification systems, but I am unaware if any locally derived standards are advocated. The authors should also highlight that LEED and BREEAM most of the credits in these standards target building sustainability. Indoor environmental quality forms parts of the credits that are offered in both, yet the proportion of these is relatively small in comparison. This may be why IEQ satisfaction is similar across certified and non-certified BREEAM and LEED buildings: Altomonte et al. Indoor environmental quality and occupant satisfaction in green-certified buildings and Altomonte et al. Satisfaction with indoor environmental quality in BREEAM and non-BREEAM certified office buildings. I think that this, and other relevant literature, could be included.

Response 5: Thank you for your valuable feedback and suggestions. We appreciate your insights into the need to emphasize local or national sustainability standards in Section 2.2 of our paper. Additional literature is added

Comments 6: Section 2.3.3: I would suggest that the authors review the WELL standard. This is more human centered than other certification labels, specifically designed to promote human health and well-being in buildings. This is also an international standard, which has seven certified buildings listed in its public directory from Jordan.

Response 6: Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. The WELL standard indeed holds a unique position among sustainable building certification labels due to its explicit focus on promoting human health and well-being within building environments.

It aligns closely with our research focus on occupant satisfaction and indoor environmental quality (IEQ).
We recognize the significance of the WELL standard as an international framework designed to enhance the quality of life and well-being of building occupants. We agree that incorporating information about WELL-certified buildings in Jordan and how they relate to occupant satisfaction and IEQ would provide valuable insights.

Comments 7: The research methodology (a) and (b) are confusing. If (a) was a comprehensive literature review, how is the primary data collection method a questionnaire? Does this mean there were two main sources of information that were gathered: Literature review and questionnaire? I think (a) could be omitted given that it is not included in the results.
Response 7: Thank you for your valuable feedback and suggestions. You are correct that the (a) component, which was a comprehensive literature review, was not explicitly linked to the primary data collection method (b), which involved the use of a questionnaire.
Upon reflection, we agree with your suggestion that (a) can be omitted from the methodology section since it did not directly contribute to the results of our study. The primary data collection method was indeed the questionnaire, and the literature review served as a foundation for understanding existing practices, identifying research gaps, and developing our research instrument.
The methodology section is revised to enhance its clarity by removing the reference to (a) and focusing on the primary data collection process.

Comments 8: Lines 351 to 365 should be added to Section 3.1 (e.g., "The final sample size included…) I would also recommend adding another section about the survey design. The authors only mention the Likert scale but not how many points, what questions were asked or how many. I think the scale was 5-points (from Figure 3), meaning that 0 was "disagree", 5 was "agree", and "3" was indifferent. Please clarify this. Also, how was Figure 2, awareness, gauged? Was this a simple yes/no question to five concepts?
Response 8: Thank you for your constructive feedback and suggestions. We greatly appreciate your attention to detail and your valuable input. Here are our responses and the actions we will take to address your comments:
Regarding the placement of Lines 351 to 365: You suggested that these lines should be added to Section 3.1. We agree with your recommendation and incorporated these lines into Section 3.1 to provide a more coherent and complete description of our sample size and survey design.
Adding a section about survey design: You correctly pointed out that we should include a dedicated section describing the survey design, including details about the Likert scale used and the questions asked. A new section was added in the methodology to address these aspects explicitly. We clarified the Likert scale used (5-point) and provide information about the questions asked and their format.
Clarifying Figure 2 (awareness): We will provide additional information about how awareness was gauged in Figure 2. This will include an explanation of the questions posed

to participants and the response format (e.g., yes/no) used to assess awareness.

Comments 9: Please improve Figure 3. The x-axis shows the questions, but they are incomplete. For example, the authors highlighted the last bar orange to highlight its importance. However, this says "Overall implantation of the…" All the text is required for the reader to understand the result. I would also recommend ordering the mean scores from lowest to highest, and more importantly, including the standard deviation. The graph shows the aggregate values and not the spread or distribution. Both are needed to understand the data.

Response 9: Thank you for your valuable feedback. We made the necessary improvements to Figure 3 to ensure clarity and completeness. We included the full text for each question on the x-axis, reordered the mean scores from lowest to highest, and included standard deviation information to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the data. Your suggestions are greatly appreciated, and we enhanced the clarity of the figure.

Comments 10: The interpretation of the results is not clear. The authors say, "a mean score of 3.10, suggesting moderate adoption." Without knowing the actual scale, the values become abstract. If a 5-point agree-disagree bipolar scale was used, then 3 would be "indifferent". Therefore, a mean score of 3.10 cannot suggest moderate adoption. The authors need to indicate the mean score and its corresponding descriptor or meaning on the scale. An alternative solution would be to include the descriptors in Figure 3 – either as a secondary axis or next to the values on the primary axis.

Response 10: Thank you for your feedback. We understand the need for clarity in interpreting the results. To address this, we specified the scale used for the mean scores and provided corresponding descriptors to make the interpretation more concrete.

Comments 11: Similar issues occur in Figure 4 and 5. Also, why is the formatting different from Figure 3? If the authors would like to retain the same formatting in Figure 4, please do not interpolate the points. The values are unrelated to each other.

Response 11: Thank you for pointing out the issues in Figures 4 and 5. We apologize for any inconsistencies in formatting. To address this, we formatted Figures 4 and 5 to be consistent with Figure 3. We will also refrain from interpolating points that are unrelated to each other to maintain clarity and accuracy in the presentation of results.

Comments 12: I think that the results are interesting but do not really show what the authors want to reveal, or at least they are presented in a way that shows this. My main recommendation is to include clearly the 5-point scale and use this to indicate supportive or unsupportive evidence (e.g., above and below the neutral point), for each question.

Response 12: We appreciate your feedback and agree that providing a clearer presentation of the results using the 5-point scale to indicate supportive or unsupportive evidence for each question is a valuable suggestion. We made the necessary revisions to the presentation of the results to enhance clarity and better convey the findings as per your recommendation.

4. Response to Comments on the Quality of English Language

( ) 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

(x) English language fine. No issues detected

Response: Thank you

5. Additional clarifications

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