|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Abstract** |  |  |
| **#1** Abstract: Abstract is clear but need to add core argument or research gap being addressed | The abstract has been adjusted accordingly to highlight both the core argument and research gap under study. |  |
| **Introduction – literature review** |  |  |
| **#2** The literature review requires substantial revision. From my perspective, the authors start by introducing the topic in too broad of a context. Given that this is a single case study, I suggest framing the topic around more proximate variables—rather than distal health status. Singapore as a case study can be brought forward as a critical context in which to study the phenomenon.  **#14** My main query is about the underlying gap in knowledge. It is not clear what contribution to knowledge this paper is making.  **#64** The reader could benefit if the authors provided some additional context related to the concept of place. In this vein, it is argued by environmental psychologists that connections with place is based on emotions, beliefs, understandings, and values for a locality. In this sense, what I get from the authors is a somewhat narrow focus, whereas sense of place ought to be broader. This does not affect the study in any way, but I think it is important that the authors set the context for place in this way. For instance, it may be worthwhile to provide a definition of place from Tuan or Relph… "What begins as undifferentiated space becomes a place as we get to know it better and endow it with value" (Tuan, 1977). **It would also be interesting to theorize about what it exactly is about urban environments vs. natural environments that lead to differences in wellbeing.**  **#72** I believe the door is open to explore nature placemaking in greater detail, particularly from a deeper human perception perspective. This particular study is narrow in that regard as it tackles the participants' subjective sense of wellbeing based on limited theoretical framework. Again, that is fine, but that should be further explained. | **#2, 14, 15, 64, 72**  We would like to express our gratitude to the reviewers for their insightful suggestions on how to better frame the literature review and conceptual framework of this study.  We have taken in consideration all the points highlighted by first focusing the case of study in the city of Singapore as the main context. Additionally, we have provided further context on the definition of placemaking and how it relates to the notion of nature-placemaking. By doing this we have also exposed the importance of making place in tandem with meanings, values, and beliefs created individually and collectively as part of a cyclical process also impacted by the makers of place or/and facilitators of place.  In the restructured literature review, we have clarified both the research gap(s) see paragraphs **#1,** **2, 11** in which we argue that although Singapore has increased the access to urban green infrastructure, there is a need to move beyond a superficial contact with nature. We also discuss that to bring the benefits of being exposed to nature, a closer identification and interconnectedness with the natural environment is necessary (Lumber et al., 2017). Subsequently, we propose nature-placemaking as an alternative to enhance the human-nature connection in cities, hence, more exploration on the methods applied, frequency and time of engagement is needed. Additionally, we have included further information related to the facilitators of nature-placemaking and their role assisting people to create new values and meanings with the natural environment. In this point we have also identified that given the newness of nature-placemaking in cities, how facilitators influence the process and the perceived sense of psychological wellbeing of people has not been yet discussed – see paragraph **#11**.  Lumber, R., Richardson, M., & Sheffield, D. (2017). Beyond knowing nature: Contact, emotion, compassion, meaning, and beauty are pathways to nature connection. PLOS ONE, 12(5), e0177186. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0177186. |  |
| **#3** Authors should clarify if the study is about the act of participation or the UGS itself (the former seems to be the aim). Why is Singapore relevant and useful to the discourse in general? What is novel or innovative about this study? | **#3, 15**  Nature-placemaking is in fact part of a participatory process - this is already implicit in the main conceptual framework explained -see paragraphs **# 4, 5, 6**. However, in tandem with its participative character it is important to notice that in the case study analysed (bottom-up nature-placemaking activities facilitated by an NGO), both participation and the natural green spaces in which nature-placemaking is conducted are interrelated. We consider this topic to be extremely relevant for the context of Singapore since it offers a unique case of nature-placemaking against the prevailing tabula rasa redevelopment and artificial reconstruction of the city’s landscape – see paragraph **#2**. Furthermore, more emphasis should be placed in the process of facilitation and the facilitators of nature-placemaking to avoid overpowering, imposition, and superficial beautification of green spaces in which citizens have minimal engagement in the long term (Hes et al., 2020) – as it has been the case for the programmes conducted by the Singapore government (see paragraph **#9)**. Hence, this study pretends to highlight the role of the facilitators of nature-placemaking in assisting in the process of promoting a meaningful connection to the natural environment through social-ecological values (identified in this study as the 5Gs: Gracious, Green, Giving, Grounded and Grateful). The facilitator’s methods and influence in the perception of psychological sense wellbeing in those taking part in the activities were also determinants for participants to enact feelings of social cohesion, sense of community, self-esteem, and self-efficacy.  Hes D., Hernandez-Santin C., Beer T., Huang S., 2020. Place Evaluation: Measuring What Matters by Prioritising Relationships. In Placemaking Fundamentals for the Built Environment. Palgrave Macmillan, Singapore.  Collective or community gardening often occurs with the support of the government (e.g., communities in bloom) or NGO citizen led initiatives – these initiatives are often small at the neighbourhood level and just few have lasted for few years.  GUI is an NGO that for over a decade has implemented a distinctive approach to interact with nature actively by introducing a values system that promotes sustainable living and to raise awareness on the importance of the non-curated natural environment.  We question about how facilitation occurs depending on the context, how the facilitators influence the process, and how long the facilitation should take place for people perceive the benefits in the long term has not yet been discussed.  **#73** Much of placemaking, however, ignores an ecological approach and thus, there is a lack of literature related to nature placemaking. Hes et al. (2020) posited that people's connection with the natural environment enhances wellbeing; however, the conventional conceptualization of placemaking overlooks the biophilic element. In that sense, **the process of nature placemaking and the role of the facilitator is essential.** This study highlights that important connection that people have with nature. The study effectively produces important and relevant findings, particularly that individuals manifest a strong connection and further exploration to the natural environment upon their first experience with GUI. The importance of nature placemaking has relevance  for nature-based solutions for tackling environmental challenges and building capacity and support for sustainable human development. | Since the literature review has been restructure, we suggest a full read of the section. Direct response to the comments is found in paragraphs **# 2, 4, 5, 6, 9.** |
| **#60** Pg. 23. Line 14 - can you say more about what other organisations do and their methods of facilitating nature placemaking - that might be helpful early on in the paper to clarify the novelty of this paper and its contribution to knowledge.  **#6** Clear conceptual framework of mechanisms is needed. | **#6, 60**  This information could be included in the last paragraph of the lit review… | See paragraphs **# 10** and **11.** |
| **#24** Facilitators of place - what exactly does a facilitator do that is distinct from a volunteer? And why is it NGO-led facilitating that is of interest to you (pg. 3, lines 12-13)? Is this part of the gap in knowledge? Or is the gap related to a lack of sources written about Singapore? Does that mean we know lots about facilitating by other sectors? You need to make this all clearer for the reader. | **#24**  To better clarify the role of facilitators of place we have included a subsection in the literature review under the heading: **Nature-placemaking led by NGOs and its facilitators -** see paragraphs **#10 and 11.** Additionally, kindly refer to our response to comment **#3** which clarifies the gap in knowledge related to nature-placemaking facilitators. | See paragraphs **#10 and 11.** |
| **#15** Don't we already know about these relationships between facilitating nature connectedness and wellbeing - why exactly is it useful to read about this case in Singapore? This novelty needs to be made much clearer. At the moment, I am not sure what research question is being asked and why. | **#15**  We thank the reviewer for highlighting the lack of clarity in our introduction and framing of the research problem. We have adjusted the literature review and conceptual framework to better clarify the study novelty, research questions and gaps. Kindly see our response to comments **#2** and **3**, and please see paragraphs **#1,** **2, 11.** | See paragraphs **# 1, 2** and **11.** |
| **#7** It is also unclear how environmental awareness relates and should be included in the conceptual framework. | We thank the reviewer for highlighting this point. While environmental awareness has been found to be associated with a sense of connectedness to nature and ecological behaviour (see Mayer & Frantz, 2004), we have strengthened our argument in the literature review to make this connection clearer for our conceptual framework. Importantly is to clarify that a key point of this study was to explore if participation in nature-placemaking could enact environmental awareness and/or pro-environmental attitudes. This was explored in the first phase of the study through the qualitative analysis. Participants of the FG manifested to have awaken a greater sense of environmental awareness and care for the natural environment. Subsequently, to triangulate these results and to apply objective measurements, the connectedness to nature scale (CNS) by Mayer and Frantz (2004) was included in the survey to measure the degree of nature connection among the GUI members.  Mayer S. Frantz Mc C. (2004). The Connectedness to Nature Scale: A measure of Individuals’ Feeling in Community with Nature. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 24(4) 503-525. |  |
| **#19** Introduction - you start with a discussion about stress - why? Is this a measure you use later? | We thank the reviewer for highlighting this point. Since we are not directly measuring stress, we have adjusted our literature review and emphasise the components that are analysed in the study as part of the contribution of nature-placemaking in the subjective sense of wellbeing e.g., autonomy, competence, relatedness, self-esteem, self-efficacy, connection to nature, and feelings of social cohesion, sense of community.  REVIEW… | See introduction/literature review section. |
| **#20** Definition of nature placemaking really needs defining more clearly. Does this mean that all previous place-making has not involved nature? Why is there a need for this distinction? Is this the only concept - is this about place-making or is it about place-keeping, stewardship, engagement with nature, connectedness to nature? I'm not sure why the concept you use is best described as 'nature placemaking'. | We would like to thank the reviewer for raising our awareness on the lack of clarity on the concept of place-making in the paper. To better provide a succinct yet comprehensive understanding on the concept - that can be found from paragraph **#9 -** we have included the subsection in the literature review: **The way to do it in Singapore: Nature-Placemaking**. In this subsection we explain the distinction between placemaking and nature-placemaking, which primarily stands for the introduction of a meaningful and transcendental experience with the natural environment through which and opportunity to reconnect with the natural environment is enabled as well as the introduction of environmental awareness, pro-environmental attitudes etc. (Davis et al., 2011; Lumber et al., 2017). A corollary of the nature-placemaking process is an enhanced subjective sense of health and wellbeing. Some of the activities include nature programmes such as farming and gardening are designed to enable self-reflection, gratitude, and compassion towards the natural environment (Bush et al., 2020). As such, nature-placemaking goes beyond a superficial interaction with the natural environment and considers the intangible experience and meanings and feelings of interconnectedness with the surrounding natural environment. | See paragraphs **# 9,** and **10.** |
| **#21** You talk about how the benefits of 'programmes' 'can be traced back to the participative character of placemaking, which have been found to enhance sense of belonging and sense of community' (pg. 2, lines 37-39). Are you there claiming that NATURE placemaking (or whatever you call it) brings even more enhanced sense of belonging and sense of community because it is in nature? If so, you need to explain this more and make it more explicit. | yes |  |
| **#22** Jennings and Bamkole (2019) paper and do not agree that they concluded that that 'a reflexive process of social learning and co-creation…could facilitate urban environmental planning' (pg. 2, lines 53-56). Take care not to lose the meanings when summarising findings from other work. | We would like to thank the reviewer for this observation. We have adjusted in paragraph 8 the interpretation of Jennings and Bamkole (2019) study. | Paragraph **#8** |
| **#23** How does listening to the voices of the often-silenced (pg. 2, line 58) stimulate environmental awareness and enhance sense of place - I don't understand a. how this fits with your work, or b. where this conclusion is coming from. | In the corrected version of the literature review we have adjusted the conceptual framework. In particular, we have clarified how environmental awareness could be enhanced through nature-placemaking. | See paragraphs 4 to 9. |
| **#25** Pg. 3, line 40 - what is a 'nature self-motivating environment'? This does not make sense to me. | We thank the reviewer for this observation. For the sake of clarity, we have amended the full sentence: *“The result of being part of a self-motivating environment is that individuals can sustain citizen engagement and thus build a sense of ownership towards the natural environment over time and construction of alternative values towards nature”* (see paragraph **#10**). | Paragraph **#10** |
| **#13** The discussion needs to more clearly link back to the literature and surface key findings. I am still confused at this point because the study is not about nature—it is **about** participation. Furthermore, the authors acknowledge they did not measure the environment. This paper is less about health/wellbeing and nature and really about social benefits of participation. | We appreciate the reviewer’s comment. Please kindly refer to our response to comment **#3.**  The paper has not been framed to discuss about nature, but how the benefits of placemaking in a natural context can enhance the sense of health and wellbeing. Since placemaking is often a process that entails facilitation (ref), the study aimed at understanding to what extent this particular type of placemaking ‘nature placemaking’ might be influenced by facilitators.  Disagree with this statement: *“This paper is less about health/wellbeing and nature and really about social benefits of participation”*, we measure the extent to which people involved in nature placemaking might perceive a heighten sense of health and wellbeing, which ultimately is correlated to the social and participative character of ‘placemaking’.  Disagree.  Social participation has an impact on health and wellbeing. (check the literature review). |  |
| **#65** I think this is acceptable to maintain a narrow focus in this regard, however, the authors need to articulate the restricted definition of their study and the existing research specific to their application. In doing so, they should highlight the broader body of knowledge. | We appreciate the reviewer’s recommendation and we have articulated the study focus by also including the existing research conducted in the topics of nature-placemaking and its facilitators. Kindly see our response to comments **#2, 14, 15, 64, 72.** |  |
| **#73** Much of placemaking, however, ignores an ecological approach and thus, there is a lack of literature related to nature placemaking. Hes et al. (2020) posited that people's connection with the natural environment enhances wellbeing; however, the conventional conceptualization of placemaking overlooks the biophilic element. In that sense, the process of nature placemaking and the role of the facilitator is essential. **This study highlights that important connection that people have with nature. The study effectively produces important and relevant findings, particularly that individuals manifest a strong connection and further exploration to the natural environment upon their first experience with GUI. The importance of nature placemaking has relevance**  **for nature-based solutions for tackling environmental challenges and building capacity and support for sustainable human development.** | We would like to express our gratitude to the reviewer for appreciating the importance and relevance of this study and the contribution of nature-placemaking in relationship with NBS, especially in current times where a more meaningful connection to the natural environment is required to support sustainable human and environmental development.  REVIEW |  |
| **Methods** |  |  |
| **#4** Please define that many terms or remove jargon for a broad academic audience.  One case study is not adequate for a research paper. | While we understand the reviewer concerns regarding publishing a paper with only one case study, we would like to emphasise that indeed a study conducted in only one case study is appropriate for publication, this is also commonly known as *intrinsic* case study. In this approach, one case study is typically undertaken to learn about a specific phenomenon and the researcher(s) define the uniqueness of the phenomenon making the case study distinguishable from others (Crowe *et al.* 2011). Please notice that in the methods section, we provide information regarding the uniqueness of the case study selected in this case GUI (see paragraph **#**). Furthermore, several examples are found in papers analysing unique phenomena in everyday contexts in which they occur. This could include minority groups overcoming a disaster event, as found in the longitudinal study conducted by Moreno and Shaw (2018) with a small coastal community in Chile, or marginalised communities (see Fahlberg, 2019’s study conducted in the City of God favela), or single case studies conducted to explore behavioural relationship across specific populations - see Hellström *et al.* 2005’s single case study of an elderly married couple living with dementia.  Crowe, S., Cresswell, K., Robertson, A., Huby, G., Avery, A., & Sheikh, A. (2011). The case study approach. BMC medical research methodology, 11, 100. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-11-100.  Moreno, J., Shaw, D. Women’s empowerment following disaster: a longitudinal study of social change. Nat Hazards 92, 205–224 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-018-3204-4.  Fahberg A., N. (2018). Rethinking Favela Governance: Nonviolent Politics in Rio de Janeiro’s Gang Territories. Politics & Society, vol. 46, 4, pp. 485–512.  Hellström I, Nolan M, Lundh U. 'We do things together': A case study of 'couplehood' in dementia. Dementia. 2005;4:7–22. doi: 10.1177/1471301205049188. | See methods section. |
| **#8** Grounded theory analysis does not apply to this research design—the authors' used existing measures. I don't understand how Grounded theory applies especially since the authors were not focused on theory building. | Grounded theory is to analyse qualitative data, which informed the selection of variables and scales for quantitative surveys |  |
| **#16** Even though the title tells us this is about the facilitators in this case in Singapore, I think this is what we learn least about in the paper. It's not until we see the numbers in Table 5 and Figure 6 and a statement on pg. 21, lines 43-45 that 'ultimately, the volunteers of this group [2] become the facilitators and guides for those in Group 1'. This is really important, but you describe them all as participants and so makes it difficult for the reader to decipher the findings and their implications. | **This is very important** | vrjbolfd |
| **#17** It also might help explain your tiny sample numbers in this group (although not justify completely, as the same explanation isn't made for the even smaller numbers in Groups 3 and 4). |  |  |
| **#18** queries about the research design - you make so much of the role of facilitators - but you don't compare it to programmes without facilitators or any kind of comparative analysis which makes it difficult for the reader. Did you consider a control (i.e. self-moderated nature placemaking without  any facilitators) to compare? Is it possible to use GUI sites without any facilitation? This constraint should be outlined in the methods section as it is only broadly touched in in the Limitations section. | Yes, we considered having control group. However, interactions with the GUI facilitators are inevitable in the GUI campus. All existing programs have extensive involvement of facilitators. Even by just visiting the campus, visitors will have some interactions with facilitators. Hence, it was not feasible to have control groups within the GUI campus. This could be addressed in the limitation section. |  |
| **#26** You do not explain why an in-depth case study method is your chosen approach - explain/ justify this for the reader. |  |  |
| **#28** Make a decision about the terms you use - is it volunteers/ participants/ facilitators? When does a volunteer become a facilitator? Shouldn't you be treating them differently in your analysis - hencethe underlying focus of the paper…yes? |  |  |
| **#29** Does the nature placemaking happen at the GUI headquarters? Where are they? How close is the site for people to reach? Do you need a car to get there? Is it easy to get to? How large is the site? Can you provide a plan? |  |  |
| **#59 (#29)** Pg. 22. Line 43 - I think you need to provide some information about the physical setting as it seems that it is integral to the study and understanding the findings. See my earlier comments on this (in Methods). It would be logical to expect that because you are examining connection to nature that conducting this research in a natural environment would glean a positive association. This is not a new finding. | While the earlier studies have found that extensive involvement in nature can enhance connections to nature, the mechanism of the enhancement and potential roles of facilitators in nature-placemaking to support the process is not known. Therefore, one of the main goals of the study is to examine the influence of facilitators on enhancing nature connection. |  |
|  |  |  |
| **#30** A river (or stream?) not only supports environmental awareness and nature connection in NPM, but it is also a habitat (pg. 4, lines 35-7)…you are taking a specifically anthropocentric view of nature throughout your paper which seems to be at odds with your claims of this connection to nature. |  |  |
| **FG** |  |  |
| **#31** Why were FGs conducted with core staff members from business development, finance and marketing? What was the rationale behind this? And it is not possible when reading your quotes to work out who the specific quote comes from and which area of GUI they work in - I think that would be useful. |  |  |
| **#32** It isn't clear about the volunteers in the FGDs - are these people who actively help or facilitate or are they part of the 130000 people who have benefited from GUI activities? |  |  |
| **#34** If you did your FGDs on GUI premises, are there any problems with this - might this have influenced the data collection? There is no critique at all about GUI in any of the commentary, and I'm wondering if doing the data collection on site was problematic/ inhibit responses in any way? |  |  |
| **#35** Can you explain the rationale behind the question: 'How do you think GUI has contributed to your personal life development?' and the answers - did everyone really say that it did? |  |  |
| **#36** Pg. 7, line 27 - you state that 'these findings informed the design of the online survey…' - in what way did they inform it? |  |  |
| **#37** Table 2 - are you claiming that the psychometric scales are measures of enhanced wellbeing? Where is 'wellbeing'? How did you decide on these scales and why? For example, the social cohesion work by Forrest and Kearns was not designed as a psychometric scale. |  |  |
| **#38** How and why did you decide that you wanted individuals who had been engaged in programmes for a minimum of 3 months? Did you ask them about their perceived wellbeing before they started the GUI? It's hard to understand the rationale behind the questions you asked and unpicking the way in which the input from the facilitators had an effect on people's wellbeing. |  |  |
| **#39** Why is your final sample size for the survey so small? I was expecting a larger number that 104 given your statement of the 130000 people who have benefited from GUI activities. Why did you stop at 104? |  |  |
| **Results** |  |  |
| **#40** Some of your quotes do not demonstrate the point you are making in the text -e.g. you state that 'these 5 values have been integrated in the mindset of many of the participants' - a. how can you claim this is the case? And b. I don't think the quotes on pg. 10 demonstrate this, particularly not the quote by Sophie FGD3. |  |  |
| **#41** pg. 10 line 56 - you say that the principles are 'inculcated' - is that in the people who work for GUI? You need to explain more about the sample in this way. | Check Maslow Abraham 1959, Knew knowledge in human values. |  |
| **#42** Pg. 11, line 1 - what do you mean by 'as part of a free will process'? |  |  |
| **#43** Figure 5 - where is the statistical significance shown - is that what green means? This is not clear. You say that 'this suggests that individuals that report having a sense of community doe to their engagement in GUI NPM developed feelings of interest….' - I am nervous about the use of the term 'due to'. You are suggesting causality when you are only analysing the correlations, so you should change your text to reflect this. Does it rather show (or indicate) that the values people hold around sense of community are closely related to those around social cohesion etc. That has been borne out in other studies. |  |  |
| **#10** "A two-tailed test of significance indicated that there was a significant positive relationship between the frequency of engagement and commitment and the number of programmes attended" - These variables should be treated as having collinearity—rather than correlated to each other. |  |  |
| **#11** Authors cannot claim impact, only correlation. This was not a longitudinal study. It is just as likely that those with greater sense of community would be more likely to engage more frequently. This is also true of social cohesion. While the authors used appropriate statistical tests, interpretations are incorrect. | Rephrasing, interpretation is correct.  Results of focus group discussions suggest that sense of community increases over time through engagement. Hence, the study concludes that more frequent and longer engagement would lead to higher sense of community |  |
| **#12** Level of significance of tests is not reported so it is unclear which correlations are even significant. | Diagram is included, include the table. |  |
| **#44** Is IMI overcoming obstacles and getting things done efficiently? This strikes me as different to the statement sample included in Table 2. |  |  |
| **#45** Pg. 18, line 30 - you state that 'GUI tends to attract new members who have a high sense of nature connection'. This might not be the correct assumption to make - research from the IWUN project www.iwun.uk found that increases in nature connectedness was most marked in people who had not been connected beforehand. Might this be a reason for the strong scores? | Our reasoning for this argument is that, firstly, the FGDs and survey results show that the main reason to visit GUI was to interact with nature at GUI campus. This suggests that those who come to GUI have already high interests in and, perhaps connection with nature. Based on this result and the result of no significant differences in the degree of nature connection across the GUI members, we concluded that those who come to GUI are interested with nature interactions and have already high sense of connectedness with nature.  Since we cannot examine if the newer member's nature connection has increased in the beginning of their engagement at GUI because we do not have longitudinal data. Therefore, this could be examined in the future study with longitudinal research design. |  |
| **#46** Pg. 18, lines 44-45 - you state that '…suggesting that the long-term engagement with GUI could enhance sense of community' - but looking at the stats in Table 6, it doesn't look like Groups 1 and 4 are so very different when you consider that they would all be rounded up/ down to a 5, so how can you make that statement? (Can you explain the numbers in brackets/ parentheses)? I think you need to qualify this. |  |  |
| **#47** you talk about 'the sense of community in GUI' (pg. 18, line 51) - is this the sense of community that you are measuring? Rather than sense of community more widely, as defined by Forrest and Kearns? If so, then yes - of course this would increase if people are spending time doing GUI activities**.** | We would like to clarify that the Sense of Community (SOC) referred in this paper is based on McMillan and Chavis (1986): it consists of four dimensions including needs fulfilment, group membership, influence, and emotional connection. The SOC is widely used in the community studies to examine one’s strength of relationships in a geographical community like a neighborhood and a relational community such as workplace and volunteer organization. Several reviews identified SOC is positively associated with various community behaviours, psychological well-being, and life satisfaction. In this study, SOC was used to explore how levels of engagement, measured by duration, frequency, and breadth, associates with SOC. |  |
| **#48** Figure 6 really does demonstrate the disparities in the numbers across the groups - so I really think  you should explain to the reader why there aren't comparable numbers in the groups, and why you felt it was statistically valid to have one group of only 2 individuals. | Groups were identified by PCA and cluster analysis based on the three measures of engagement |  |
| **#49** Pg. 19, line 54 - you talk about facilitators but don't mention them in any of the tables/ figures. Where are the facilitators in your sample. |  |  |
| **#68** I do think the authors could, given the type of research, provide additional explanation related to how impartiality and detachment from personal bias was ensured. The authors acknowledged the use of independent researchers to compare and validate the results; however, in a more general sense, I think it is important that the authors articulate how the discussions took place to ensure participants were not led to a particular answer. |  |  |
| **#71** The research goals I thought are well defined and researched using a robust and comprehensive method. The use of seven focus groups was thorough; however, there is a disproportionate number of female respondents versus male respondents for the survey. I do not believe that would effect the results, but the authors may want to dedicate a couple of sentences to acknowledge and address it. |  |  |
| **5GS** |  |  |
| **#5** It is unclear how the "5Gs" relate to psychological/social wellbeing impacts of nature-placemaking. |  |  |
| **#27** You need to explain why the 5Gs are so important and how they are imparted to volunteers/ participants. |  |  |
| **Discussion** |  |  |
| **#50** I don't understand the statement on lines 58-60: 'people interacting in GUI NPM activities undergo a self-reflective process' - who exactly does this? If they are facilitators, is this part of their training? What training do facilitators have to undergo? |  |  |
| **#51** Figure 7 is misleading. Why is C where it is on the diagram? Are you suggesting that there are minimum attendance rates? Should there be a D in the diagram because you had 4 groups? |  |  |
| **#52** Pg. 20, lines 48-50: you do not mention in the analysis that new participants 'seek in-depth knowledge about environmental sustainability through direct interaction with nature' - where has this finding come from? | Make it clear in GUI description |  |
| **#53** Pg. 21. Lines 1 - you need to provide more explanation of the statement 'volunteers are encouraged to reflect on the GUI principles': this information should be provided in the GUI case study section (alongside how the 5Gs are communicated to volunteers/ part of the facilitator training?). And this links to information you tell us on line 43 that 'ultimately the volunteers of this group become the facilitators and guides for those in Group 1'. This should be made much clearer earlier on in the paper. At the moment, it is not at all clear who is facilitating whom. |  |  |
| **#54** Pg. 21. Line 9 - you talk about 'transference of the GUI values' which is making me nervous. Are you really claiming that all volunteers had none of these values before joining GUI? How can you separate their own values from GUI values? To claim transference is a bold statement. |  |  |
| **#55** Pg. 21. Lines 20 and 22 - where do 'sense of restoration' and 'self-awareness' appear in your analysis? |  |  |
| **#56** Pg. 21. Line 52 - you talk about an 'alternative path' - alternative to what? |  |  |
| **#57** Pg. 22. Line 1 - what do you mean by 'appreciation of the natural environment offers new perspectives already recognised in some of the components envisioned in future knowledge systems'? This does not make sense. |  |  |
| **#58** Pg. 22 Line 18 - did you ask people about making decisions and overcoming difficulties in the research to be able to make this statement? | Add some statements from FGD? If I remember correctly, some participants mentioned about overcoming challenges |  |
| **Check literature** | Thompson J mark, 1954, “experimentation with forms of good deeds in transformation of inimical into amicable relationships”. In Pitirim Sorokin Forms and techniques of altruistic love and spiritual growth: A symposium, Boston: Beacon Press.  Tiryakian Edward A 1963. Sociological Theory Values, and Sociocultural Change: Essays in Honor of Pitirim Sorokin.  Wispe Lauren, 1978: Altruism, Sympathy and Helping: Psychological and Sociological Principles.  Marta Botta. Evolution of the slow living concept within the models of sustainable communities (check literature review and findings) **(downloaded)**.  **Joanne Vining, Melinda S. Merrick and Emily A. Price. 2008. The Distinction between Humans and Nature: Human Perceptions of Connectedness to Nature and Elements of the Natural and Unnatural (downloaded)** |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |