

Responses to Reviewer 3 Comments (Round 2)

Thank you very much for another careful reading. As English is not a native language, there are some grammatical issues that affect the reading experience. We take your suggestion very seriously and our team has proofread the whole article using the grammar editing website recommended by the magazine and hope to achieve a satisfactory level.

Point 1: Lines 11 - 12: The sentence should be removed as it repeats the prior sentence in lines 9 - 10.

Response 1: Thank you very much for your careful reading, we have removed this sentence. It is possible that the incorrect version was presented to you due to a display error.

Point 2: ".as the subject." is a sentence fragment, please rewrite the whole sentence correctly. You also do not explain if the team are the authors or who the team is (as you stated you did in the cover letter response).

Response 2: Thank you very much for your careful reading, this sentence has been rewritten by us. The team is the Fangzhong team, which includes the author, but to prevent any misunderstanding, our team has removed this sentence.

Point 3: Lines 20 - 23: The two sentences are fragmented and unclear. Please re-write! I would once again recommend getting an editor to help proof-read and fix the errors in grammar, sentence structure and fragmentation. The errors make it difficult to read and understand what ought to be a very interesting and valuable paper.

Response 3: Thank you very much for your suggestion. Our team has enlisted the help of the grammar editor recommended by the magazine to help with the changes and hopefully we can achieve a satisfactory level.

Point 4: Line 43: "Which bring challenges to the design of commercial building space traffic flow" is a fragmented sentence. What brings challenges to the design of commercial building space traffic flow? Is it the factors mentioned in the prior sentence such as fuzzy functions and topicalizations? If so, then state that these factors of commercial space use bring challenges and describe some of the challenges.

Response 4: Thank you very much for your suggestion, we have rewritten this sentence. It is possible that the incorrect version was presented to you due to a display error.

Point 5: Line 66: Are the reasons listed based on the consultation with research scholars and planners? If so, do not say the reasons "may be" but that these are the reasons based on the conversations with the research scholars and planners.

Response 5: Thank you very much for your careful reading. The reasons listed are based on literature research and therefore say that the reasons "maybe".

Point 6: Line 70: Explain why a user-centered evaluation system will "probably be" an important step in design. I would also suggest using a different term to "probably be".

Response 6: Thank you very much for your careful reading. In the previous study it was mentioned that after a literature review it was found that the post-use evaluation of commercial building space traffic flow design is not satisfactory and that human-centred design principles should be followed, therefore we say that a user-centred evaluation system could be an important step in the design.

Point 7: Lines 72 - 75: Re-write the sentence.

Response 7: Thank you very much for your suggestion. Our team has enlisted the help of the grammar editor recommended by the magazine to help with the changes and hopefully we can achieve a satisfactory level.

Point 8: Line 120: As mentioned in the initial review, POE does not include instruments, rather POE+M does include the use of instruments. Please make the distinction and cite POE+M references as needed.

Response 8: Thank you very much for your suggestion. POE+M includes the use of instruments, but as this article only uses conventional POE, it does not include the use of instruments. Therefore the definition of POE+M has not been added so as not to mislead the reader.

Point 9: Please proof-read section '2.2. Theoretical Framework', it really needs edits.

Response 9: Thank you very much for your suggestion. Our team has enlisted the help of the grammar editor recommended by the magazine to help with the changes and hopefully we can achieve a satisfactory level.

Point 10: Line 406: Remove the additional "4. Results" mentioned. It is subsection 4.2

Response 10: Thank you very much for your careful reading. We have removed "4. Results" and it is possible that the incorrect version was presented to you due to a display error.

Point 11: Line 420: Shouldn't it be sub-subsection 4.2.2?

Line 433: Shouldn't it be subsection 4.3?

Response 11: Thank you very much for your suggestion. We have re-calibrated the numbering of each chapter.