|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| Book Name: | **Materials That Matter: The Future of Interiors through Innovation** |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_BPR\_5829.2** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **A systematic Review of Biophilic Design studies in context of Indoor Environment** |
| Type of the Article | **Book Chapter** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | **This systematic review provides a comprehensive synthesis of biophilic design research from 2000 to 2025, bridging global trends with culturally rooted practices in India. It highlights the multidisciplinary applications of biophilic principles in enhancing health, sustainability, and productivity while addressing critical gaps in longitudinal and geographically diverse studies. The integration of traditional Indian architectural elements (e.g., *jalis*, courtyards) with modern biophilic principles offers actionable insights for tropical urban regions, making it valuable for architects, policymakers, and public health researchers. However, the reliance on qualitative studies and underrepresentation of the Global South limit its generalizability, which future research should address.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title "A systematic Review of Biophilic Design studies in context of Indoor Environment" is mostly appropriate but could be refined for clarity. Suggested revision: *"A Systematic Review of Biophilic Design in Indoor Environments: Health, Sustainability, and Cultural Perspectives."*** |  |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | **The abstract succinctly outlines the study’s scope, methodology, and key findings but lacks specificity about the methodological gaps identified (e.g., qualitative dominance, regional biases). Suggestions:**   * **Clarify the contradictory timeframe ("2000 to 2025") given the publication date.** * **Emphasize the cultural contextualization of biophilic design in India.** * **Highlight the underrepresentation of tropical regions in current research.** |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | **The manuscript is scientifically valid but constrained by:**   * **Geographic bias: Overrepresentation of temperate regions vs. tropical climates.** * **Methodological gaps: Short-term studies dominate; longitudinal data are sparse.** * **Stakeholder exclusion: Limited engagement with community voices or policy frameworks. These limitations are acknowledged in the discussion, ensuring transparency.** |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | **References are recent (2015–2023) and relevant, but key gaps include:**   * **Limited studies from tropical regions (e.g., only one Indian case study cited).** * **Omission of foundational works like Ulrich’s (1984) *View Through a Window* on nature’s health impacts.** * **Absence of emerging tech-focused studies (e.g., AI-driven biophilic simulations).** |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language is generally scholarly but has inconsistencies:   * **Example 1**: "Artificially controlled environments have created the importance..." → *"The rise of artificially controlled environments has heightened the importance..."* * **Example 2**: "But still biophilic design presents significant opportunities..." → *"Despite these challenges, biophilic design offers..."* * **Redundancy**: "methodological and implementation limitation" → *"methodological limitations in implementation."* |  |
| Optional/General comments |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PART 2:** | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s comment *(if agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)* |  |

**Reviewer details:**

**Joseph Aaron Tsapa, USA**