




Socio-Ecological Support and Physical Facilities Satisfaction: How They Link to Social Participation and Well-Being among Urban Residents in Malaysia

Sustainability **2022**, *14*(3), 1184; <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031184>

by Mohd Mahzan Awang ^{1,*} , Alfitri Alfitri ² , Abdul Razaq Ahmad ¹ , Jalal Deen Careemdeen ¹  and Juhari Ahmad ³ 

Reviewer 1: Anonymous

Reviewer 2: Anonymous

Sustainability **2022**, *14*(3), 1184; <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031184>

Received: 5 November 2021 / Revised: 16 January 2022 / Accepted: 17 January 2022 / Published: 21 January 2022
(This article belongs to the Section Sustainable Urban and Rural Development)

Round 1

Reviewer 1 Report

L 100-140 a broader context than just Malaysia is needed. The topic is important and often analysed in the global literature. More citations showing the global context is needed.

L 746 throughout the article I was waiting for a comment on green infrastructure - from the current article it seems in a short thought that the most important thing for feeling happy is the presence of waste bins which is not true

Recreation - when is it possible? What level of happiness or comfort is provided by what amount of greenery? I think a fundamental element in that paper is missing

I think the key question is what kind of environment makes people happy - concrete and full of roads or greenery? Especially in times of pandemics ... referring to the physical and mental illnesses mentioned at the end of this chapter

The paper does not address a key aspect: green infrastructure - if only in relation to other studies - this is necessary for the discussion

L 754 as eye charming and charming buildings - are buildings really eye pleasing? Please support this thesis with research

Author Response

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you very much for your valuable comments and suggestions. We have improved the manuscript as requested. For your information, the manuscript was based on the empirical research in Malaysia. We hope the corrected version is accepted for publication. Your consideration is highly appreciated. Thank you very much.

Authors

Author Response File:  [Author Response.pdf](#)

Reviewer 2 Report

I would like to add a few minor revisions, but overall the content is scientifically sound, well-structured and interesting.

Sub paragraph 37

"Several traditional elements concerning local values and culture have also undergone rapid changes"

it would be useful to put in brackets some of these elements, this could help even more in understanding

Sub paragraph 139

"Several initiatives are being undertaken on a global scale to address urban issues, such as crime rates, infectious diseases, housing complications, traffic congestion, flash floods, water allocation, depletion of water and destruction of property and urban poverty"

It would be useful to mention some of the most important

Sub paragraph 275

"The current study"

there is an error, delete a t

Author Response

Dear Reviewer

Thank you very much for your feedback. We have improved the manuscript. We hope that the manuscript is accepted for publication. Your consideration is appreciated. Very best regards.

Authors

Author Response File:  [Author Response.pdf](#)

This manuscript is a resubmission of an earlier submission. The following is a list of the peer review reports and author responses from that submission.

Round 1

Reviewer 1 Report

see attached

Comments for author File:  **Comments.pdf**

Reviewer 2 Report

Major 1. The methods of this study are unclear, such as basic information, basic statistics, sampling, surveyed items, and data analysis. This study should largely revise the method of this study.

2. The basic information was not provided in the results, such as normal distribution, reliability of each variable, etc.

3. The SD ranged from 0.3-0.5, indicating the variance was low in this study. This study should check the basic information, such as consistent answers or the validity of the surveyed items.

4. There were too many tables in the article that should be combined.

5. The purpose of this study did not match the data analysis and results that should be clearly matched and reduced the unnecessary analysis and tables

Reviewer 3 Report

The article is written in a one-sided manner, the introduction does not address many important issues for social bonds e.g. the impact of greenery on social relations e.g. Sustainability | Free Full-Text | Perception of Urban Trees by Polish Tree Professionals vs. Nonprofessionals (mdpi.com)

There is a lack of citations that would convince the reader of the deep analysis of the topic done by the Authors.

As the work has insufficient theoretical basis, unclearly described methodology and results it is difficult to assess its value. A very considerable and important work has been done but it is necessary to improve the presentation of its results.

Specific remarks:

Mentioned in M&M section „charming buildings, cleanliness and safety of assets, facilities and infrastructure in residential, public and recreational areas” should be described w Introduction section.

I agree that theoretical foundations for the present study must be turned into method that was used – what and how mentioned factors were measured?

The method of respondents qualification should be described.

Line 188 and what was the result? Description of asked questions is needed

Point 4.4 is totally not clear – what was done and what is the result of analyses?

Point 4.5 how you measured level of happiness? Where are the result in table 5 from? Must be described in M&M section and in this section results.

Point 4.6 what variables have been used? Maybe having proper description of methodology in M&M section results will be more clear

L 352 what socio-ecological support does it mean in the study?

L 358 citation is needed

L 384 – Which analyses conducted indicate such conclusions? Where in the results is NGO s mentioned?

L 401 It is not only clean sidewalks that are important I miss the reference to the benefits provided by green areas The paper mentions ecological well-being but neither the research nor the introduction section nor the results make any reference to the ecological theme Playgrounds are facilities not nature. Residents of the cities can't have wellbeing without nature. If you don't agree please discuss that.

Reviewer 4 Report

The **introduction** should provide the background of the problem and the current state of the topic. The first part of this introductory framework is still lacking in relation to possible bibliographical references on the subject. In particular it is stated that "Several studies have claimed that urbanization and multi-migration for socio-economic purposes have changed the traditional Societal structural", what are they?. Moreover, in an attempt to fill the literary gap to which reference is made, it would be interesting to present a comparison between research already conducted on the topic and that proposed, in order better to bring out its added value.

In the section **Aims and Methods**, with respect to the sentence "The quality-of-life theory and the residential environment satisfaction determinant model are the major social well-being indicators considered in this study. In this study, four main social well-being indicators in measuring social well-being as follows: personal happiness, social networking of residents, healthy housing environment, level of safety and health and economic sustainability among urban residents", What are the principles by which these indicators are selected rather than others? What are the theoretical bases that attest to their effectiveness in measuring social well-being? In general, the method section should be clearer and more in-depth so as to allow a greater understanding of the contribution, even for readers who are not properly experts in the field of investigation.