

1 Introduction

- Line 43: Is the hyphen between the words “vision” and “receives” correct?
- The first sentence of chapter 1.1 (lines 55-59) is very long. Can you divide it into two sentences?
- Your Introduction is well written and comprehensive. However, in my opinion, you should update your references (some research you cite is from the 80s and more recently published papers are available). For example:
 - Trees reduce urban heat stress:

Potchter, O., Cohen, P., Bitan, A., 2006. Climatic behavior of various urban parks during hot and humid summer in the Mediterranean City of Tel Aviv, Israel. *Int. J. Climatol.* 26, 1695–1711, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/joc>

Bowler, D.E., Buyung-Ali, L., Knight, T.M., Pullin, A.S., 2010. Urban greening to cool towns and cities: a systematic review of the empirical evidence. *Landsc. Urban Plan.* 97 (3), 147–155, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2010.05.006>

Shashua-Bar, L., Potchter, O., Bitan, A., Yaakov, Y., 2010. Microclimate modelling of street tree species effects within the varied urban morphology in the Mediterranean city of Tel Aviv, Israel. *Int. J. Climatol.* 30, 44–57, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/joc>

McCarthy, M.P., Best, M.J., Betts, R.A., 2010. Climate change in cities due to global warming and urban effects. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 37, 1–5, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2010GL042845>
 - Trees reduces building energy use:

Akbari, H., Pomerantz, M., Taha, H., 2001. Cool surfaces and shade trees to reduce energy use and improve air quality in urban areas. *Sol. Energy* 70 (3), 295–310, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0038-092X\(00\)00089-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0038-092X(00)00089-X)

Nowak, D.J., Dwyer, J.F., 2007. Understanding the benefits and costs of urban forest ecosystems. In: Kuser, J.E. (Ed.), *Urban and Community Forestry in the Northeast* (2nd). Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp. 25–46, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-4289-82>

Escobedo, F.J., Kroeger, T., Wagner, J.E., 2011. Urban forests and pollution mitigation: analyzing ecosystem services and disservices. *Environ. Pollut.* 159 (8–9), 2078–2087, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2011.01.010>
 - Trees reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide:

Nowak, D.J., Dwyer, J.F., 2007. Understanding the benefits and costs of urban forest ecosystems. In: Kuser, J.E. (Ed.), *Urban and Community Forestry in the Northeast* (2nd). Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp. 25–46, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-4289-82>

Escobedo, F.J., Kroeger, T., Wagner, J.E., 2011. Urban forests and pollution mitigation: analyzing ecosystem services and disservices. *Environ. Pollut.* 159 (8–9), 2078–2087, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2011.01.010>
 - Trees reduce rainfall runoff, flooding, noise levels, and wind speed:

Tyrväinen, L., Pauleit, S., Seeland, K., de Vries, S., 2005. Benefits and uses of urban forests and trees. In: Konijnendijk, C.C., Nilsson, K., Randrup, T.B., Schipperijn, J. (Eds.), *Urban Forests and Trees*. Springer, Berlin, pp. 81–114.

- Nowak, D.J., Dwyer, J.F., 2007. Understanding the benefits and costs of urban forest ecosystems. In: Kuser, J.E. (Ed.), *Urban and Community Forestry in the Northeast* (2nd). Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp. 25–46, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-4289-82>
- Trees remove air pollutants:

Nowak, D.J., Hirabayashi, S., Greenfield, E., 2014. Tree and forest effects on air quality and human health in the United States. *Environ. Pollut.* 193, 119–129, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2014.05.028>

Nowak, D.J., Dwyer, J.F., 2007. Understanding the benefits and costs of urban forest ecosystems. In: Kuser, J.E. (Ed.), *Urban and Community Forestry in the Northeast* (2nd). Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp. 25–46, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-4289-82>

Escobedo, F.J., Kroeger, T., Wagner, J.E., 2011. Urban forests and pollution mitigation: analyzing ecosystem services and disservices. *Environ. Pollut.* 159 (8–9), 2078–2087, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2011.01.010>
 - Aesthetic value of trees:

Lohr, V.I., Pearson-Mims, C.H., 2006. Responses to scenes with spreading, rounded, and conical tree forms. *Environ. Behav.* 38 (5), 667–688, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013916506287355>

Schroeder, H.W., Flannigan, J., Coles, R., 2006. Residents' attitudes toward street trees in the UK and U.S. communities. *Arboricult. Urban For.* 32 (5), 236–246.
 - Relief from stress when being surrounded by nature:

Jiang, B., Chang, C.-Y., Sullivan, W.C., 2014a. A dose of nature: tree cover, stress reduction, and gender differences. *Landsc. Urban Plan.* 132, 26–36, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2014.08.005>

Jiang, B., Li, D., Larsen, L., Sullivan, W.C., 2014b. A dose–response curve describing the relationship between urban tree cover density and self-reported stress recovery. *Environ. Behav.*, 1–23, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013916514552321>

Van den Berg, A.E., Jorgensen, A., Wilson, E.R., 2014. Evaluating restoration in urban green spaces: does setting type make a difference? *Landsc. Urban Plan.* 127, 173–181, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2014.04.012>
 - The presence of nearby nature increases property values:

Wolch, J. R., Byrne, J., & Newell, J. P. (2014). Urban green space, public health, and environmental justice: The challenge of making cities 'just green enough'. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 125, 234–244, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2014.01.017>
 - Trees contribute to urban neighbourhoods' aesthetic quality and enhance human mental and physical health and well-being:

Tyrväinen, L., Pauleit, S., Seeland, K., de Vries, S., 2005. Benefits and uses of urban forests and trees. In: Konijnendijk, C.C., Nilsson, K., Randrup, T.B., Schipperijn, J. (Eds.), *Urban Forests and Trees*. Springer, Berlin, pp. 81–114.

Nilsson, K., Sangster, M., Konijnendijk, C.C., 2011. Forests trees and human health and well-being: introduction. In: Nilsson, K., Sangster, M., Gallis, C., Hartig, T., de Vries, S., Seeland, K., Schipperijn, J. (Eds.), *Forests, Trees and Human Health*. Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 1–19.

- De Vries, S., Verheij, R.A., Groenewegen, P.P., Spreeuwenberg, P., 2003. Natural environments – healthy environments? An exploratory analysis of the relationship between greenspace and health. *Environ. Plan.* 35 (10), 1717–1731, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1068/a35111>
- Maas, J., Verheij, R.A., Groenewegen, P.P., de Vries, S., Spreeuwenberg, P., 2006. Green space, urbanity, and health: how strong is the relation? *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* 60 (7), 587–592, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jech.2005.043125>
- Maas, J., Verheij, R.A., de Vries, S., Spreeuwenberg, P., Schellevis, F.G., Groenewegen, P.P., 2009. Morbidity is related to a green living environment. *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* 63 (12), 967–973, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jech.2008.079038>
- Mitchell, R., Popham, F., 2007. Greenspace, urbanity and health: Relationships in England. *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* 61 (8), 681–683, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jech.2006.053553>
- Taylor, M.S., Wheeler, B.W., White, M.P., Economou, T., Osborne, N.J., 2015. Research note: urban street tree density and antidepressant prescription rates – a cross-sectional study in London, UK. *Landsc. Urban Plan.* 136, 174–179, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2014.12.005>
- Donovan, G.H., Michael, Y.L., Butry, D.T., Sullivan, A.D., Chase, J.M., 2011. Urban trees and the risk of poor birth outcomes. *Health Place* 17 (1), 390–393, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2010.11.004>
- Hansmann, R., Hug, S.-M., Seeland, K., 2007. Restoration and stress relief through physical activities in forests and parks. *Urban For. Urban Green.* 6 (4), 213–225, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2007.08.004>
- Korpela, K., Borodulin, K., Neuvonen, M., Paronen, O., Tyrväinen, L., 2014. Analyzing the mediators between nature-based outdoor recreation and emotional well-being. *J. Environ. Psychol.* 37, 1–7, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2013.11.003>
- Berman, M.G., Jonides, J., Kaplan, S., 2008. The cognitive benefits of interacting with nature. *Psychol. Sci.* 19 (12), 1207–1212, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02225.x>
- Tyrväinen, L., Ojala, A., Korpela, K., Lanki, T., Tsunetsugu, Y., Kagawa, T., 2014. The influence of urban green environments on stress relief measures: a field experiment. *J. Environ. Psychol.* 38, 1–9, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2013.12.005>
- Trees and nature are associated with social cohesion:

Holtan, M.T., Dieterlen, S.L., Sullivan, W.C., 2014. Social life under cover: tree canopy and social capital in Baltimore, Maryland. *Environ. Behav.* 46 (6), 1–24, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013916513518064>
 - Review articles on positive effects of nearby urban forest resources on human health and well-being:

Keniger, L.E., Gaston, K.J., Irvine, K.N., Fuller, R.A., 2013. What are the benefits of interacting with nature? *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 10 (3), 913–935, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijerph10030913>

Turner-Skoff, J. B., & Cavender, N. (2019). The benefits of trees for livable and sustainable communities. *Plants, People, Planet.* <https://doi.org/10.1002/ppp3.39>

Kondo, M. C., Fluehr, J. M., McKeon, T., & Branas, C. C. (2018). Urban green space and its impact on human health. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15030445>

Nilsson, K., Bentsen, P., Grahn, P., & Mygind, L. (2019). De quelles preuves scientifiques disposons-nous concernant les effets des forêts et des arbres

- Line 62: Shouldn't the words "highly also" be in reversed order? -> "also highly"?
- Line 71: "Life-lifting sidewalks"?
- In lines 79-80 you talk about "the intensity of an urban forest". This sounds strange to me; do you mean "tree density" or "canopy cover density"?
- Caption in line 82 "Perception on nature influence on children's development": Would "The impact of nature perception on children's development" sound better and be more correct?
- Line 84: Is there a "the" missing between the words "that majority"?
- In the sentence in lines 84-85 you say that the majority of children does not play in the countryside and have limited access to nature including trees. In my opinion the two parts of this sentence are duplicates. Can you formulate the sentence more positively, e.g. by saying where children play instead of saying where they do not play? For example: "Since the number of city dwellers increases it is no surprise that most children play indoors or in built environment and have limited access to nature including trees?"
- The sentence of lines 85-89 is very long. Can you divide it into two sentences?
- Can you provide the references for what you state in lines 97-104? Some of the statements are also supported by the references I mentioned above.
- Line 106: The year is missing when you cite Kellert et al. Furthermore, you can shorten the sentence by omitting the word "research" (and the last "s" in "demonstrates"). For example, "Kellert et al. [year] demonstrate that nature is important to children's development..."
- Is there something wrong with the sentence in lines 107-110? Does the subject of the sentence shift from "play in nature" to "time"? Would the following sentence be clearer? "Play in nature, particularly during middle childhood, is especially important for developing the capacities for creativity, problem-solving, and emotional and intellectual development [35-37]."
- Line 112: Shouldn't the "that" in the sentence be a "than" instead?
- The sentence in lines 111-115 is very long. Can you divide it into a few clearer sentences?
- Lines 116-117: Can you shortly explain what you mean by "recreation in controlled conditions"? Or could you provide examples for it?
- Line 117: Shouldn't the reference "[41-42]" be placed after "outdoor play" instead of between the words "outdoor" and "play"?

- The sentence in lines 117-119: Can you formulate the sentence in a way that avoids repetition of the word “skills”?
- I like the picture you draw in lines 119-125. However, the sentence is very long. Can you find a way to divide it into a few shorter sentences?
- Line 130: Is the word “commune” correctly used here? Would “municipality”, “community” or “town” be more appropriate?
- The sentence in lines 131-134: Can you get a bit straighter to your point and omit the part “The important element of the result interpretation was to understand...”? Why don’t you just say: “We aimed at understanding...”?

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Respondents

- Line 140: “representative” in which sense (education, gender distribution, age distribution) and for which population group?
- Line 145: So, you collected your data at school meetings? I suggest you describe the way how you collected your data before you use this fact as an explanation for the overrepresentation of women in your sample.
- Line 145: Would “With regard to...” be a better introduction to the sentence than “In terms of...”?
- Line 146: Would “dominated” be more correct than “predominated”?
- Line 146: Can you omit the word “people”? I think this is a repetition you can avoid.
- Line 148: Can you shift the word “only”: “...and 4.5% only had elementary education”? This would account for the fact that higher education levels include elementary education.
- The sentence in lines 148-150: Can you divide the sentence into two? For example, you could finish the sentence after the first part (after “to 59 (53.2%)”).
- Line 151: Is that correct English? “survey was analyzed against the place of residence criterion.”
- Table 1 (formatting): Check the alignment (“Place of living”).
- Table 1: Would “Basic education” be better described by “Elementary education”?
- “according to with” in line 157: I think you should either use “to” or “with” here, but rather not both.
- The sentence in lines 157-162 is very long. Can you divide it into a few sentences?
- Lines 157-169: How necessary is it to tell the reader that you collected the data according to all laws and regulations? Shouldn’t this be taken for granted?
- Line 162: Shouldn’t it be “performed” rather than “perform”?

- Lines 170-173: Can you shortly describe whether the respondents completed the questionnaire before or after the parent-teacher meetings? Could they also complete the questionnaire at home and send it to you afterwards?
- Line 172: Is “filled up forms” correct? Would “completed forms” be better?

2.2 Questionnaire

- Line 181: Instead of repeating the word “statement”, can you find a synonym for it?
- Line 181: Would it make sense to replace the “referred to” by “on” (“The statements on benefits and disservices...”) or “regarding”?
- Line 181: Shouldn’t the word “based” be passively used: “were based”?
- Table 2, study design: I wonder if some of your questionnaire statements work for your participant group living in the rural area (Jedlinsk). Some statements require that respondents are urban dwellers (e.g., “Make urban environment more pleasant to live, work and spend leisure time.”, “Are an escape from the hustle and bustle of the city, help people relax and calm down.”).
- Study design: Why did you choose to use the response category “Do not know”? This category does not semantically represent the middle between “Rather yes” and “Rather no”. Can you shortly describe how and why you made your decisions?
- Table 2, first row (formatting): Check the alignment.
- Table 2, “Building stronger sense of community”: Would “Increasing social cohesion” be more precise?
- Table 2: Is it possible to illustrate the contents in more space-saving way?
- Table 2, “Costs of maintaining of mature trees overwhelm their benefits”: I think you can omit the second “of”.
- Table 2, “Drip sap or sticky residue on parked Cars”: You should use lower case for “cars”
- Lines 192-193, “One of the questions asked for opinions on the contact of children with trees.”: Would “One of the questions was on opinions regarding contact of children with trees” sound better?
- Line 194: Would “stated” or “reported” be more appropriate than “presented”?
- Line 201: Why did you chose 5-point Likert scales for some questions? For these questions, what would have been the disadvantage of using the same scales (7-point Likert scales) that you used for all other questions? Maybe you could write a sentence that explains the choices you made.
- Line 202: “place of birth” would sound more familiar to me than “place of origin”.
- Line 203: “leave their comment” sounds unfamiliar to me. Would this be better: “Respondents were given the opportunity to comment on trees and nature in general”

or “Respondents were given the opportunity to state their opinion on trees and nature in general”?

2.3 Statistical Analysis of Data

- Line 208: “Data analysis” as a heading instead of “Statistical Analysis of Data”?
- Is the sentence in lines 211-214 necessary? Isn't it unusual to describe the structure of a result table in the data analysis section? The reader should be able to see that the table contains the number of indications for individual answers, their percentage distribution, the value of χ^2 , and the p value from the table and its headings itself. If the contents of the table need more explanation, I would prefer this information being presented in the table caption.
- “In these studies...” in line 215: Do you mean “In our study...”? If yes, you may omit this part of the sentence and “We compare 2 independent groups (village/city).” would be fine.
- I do not understand the sentence in line 216: “The nominal value is a variable.” Do you want to say that the tested variables are nominal (categorical) variables? Is it necessary to say this, because using the χ^2 test implies that your variables are nominal scaled? Would “We tested relationships between nominal variables.”?
- I wonder why you didn't use a t-test for independent variables or a Mann-Whitney U-test for investigating significant differences in questionnaire responses between two independent groups. A t-test requires interval scaled variables and that variables are normal distributed. One could say that agreements to statements on 5 or 7-point Likert scales does not result in interval scaled variables. However, in social sciences it is argued that if the semantic gaps between the points (1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6 – 7) are equal, the resulting variable can be regarded as interval scaled. In case your data is not normal distributed, you cannot use the t-test for independent variables, and the Mann-Whitney U-test would be the method to choose. Did I overlook anything? Why did you choose the χ^2 test? Is it because your middle response category is called “Do not know” instead of “undecided” or “yes and no”? Then, maybe you are right with choosing the χ^2 .
- Line 217: Why “a minimum”? I thought you use the test to determine the relationship between two characteristics. What do you mean when saying “relationship between a minimum of two characteristics”?
- Line 221: “H0” instead of “Ho”.
- Line 221: I think there is a full stop missing between “Y If”.

- Is the sentence in lines 225-226 correct? RStudio is an environment for using R. So, using RStudio implies that the programming language R is used. Would the following sentence be more correct? “The test was performed using RStudio (Version ??).”
- Line 226: I think you can omit the word “program” and say “...generated report from RStudio, it is possible to...”
- The sentence in lines 227-229: In my opinion, when you use the word “smaller” you should also use the word “than”. So, you should say that the respective percentage of responses is smaller than another percentage of responses. In your case, it may be best to just use “small” instead of “smaller”. But you should also state in brackets what you mean by “small”. So, you should report the percentage of responses you are talking about in this sentence. To make it short and precise, I would suggest: “Most respondents had similar perceptions with regard to mature trees (??%).” Would this express what you want to say? Then you can omit the sentence in line 229 (“Most of the respondents gave similar answers.”).
- The sentence in lines 229-230: Would this be a better and more precise alternative: “Attitudes regarding mature trees on playgrounds were most heterogeneous.”? Or do you want to say that responses of urban and rural residents differ most with regard to mature trees on playgrounds?
- The three sentences of lines 227-230: Do they refer to analysis of the distribution of individual responses and their percentage ratio? If yes, can you give a short introduction for these three sentences, for example by saying “With regard to analysis of distribution of individual responses, most respondents had similar perceptions with regard to mature trees (??%).”?

3 Case Study: Green Space Statistics in Warsaw and Jedlińsk in Brief

- Line 232: I would suggest this section to be a subsection of “2 Materials and methods”. I would name it “2.4 Study areas”.
- Line 234: Is this sentence necessary?
- Lines 242, 246, 247: “municipality” or “community” instead of “commune”?
- Line 254: Shouldn’t you use the singular: “gap” instead of “gaps”? And would “difference” be a more appropriate word than “gap”?
- Line 254: Would “big” or “large” be a more appropriate word than “wide”?
- Tables 3 and 4 (lines 256 and 259): Why do you include the overall area sizes and percentages of land use types in the first column of Table 4 (Jedlinsk), but not in the first column of Table 3 (Warsaw)? I would prefer these two tables being equally

structured and overall area sizes of land use types being presented once in km² and as percentage.

4 Results

4.1. General perception of trees: benefits and disservices of trees

- Line 265: To avoid repetition, I would delete the second “trees” in the heading.
- Line 267: In my opinion, “prove” is a too strong word here; I would rather use “show”.
- The two sentences in lines 267 and 268: The two sentences rather represent a summary of results how it is usually written in the discussion part. I would not start the results section with sentences like these and rather precisely describe the results from your analyses. If you start the results section with a summary or conclusion of your analyses, I would at least refer to the tables that justify your statements.
- Line 269: In the “Questionnaire” subsection in “Materials and methods” you talk about 5 categories, but in line 269 you use the word “groups” for the same thing. I would prefer being consistent with this and suggest using “categories” instead of “groups”.
- Heading of Table 5 (line 280): “Statistical results...” sounds too coarse and unprecise to me. Imagine a reader of your manuscript that aims at quickly scanning your results: He or she should understand the table without reading any text. So, I would suggest providing a content-related meaningful heading, e.g., “Differences in perception of social benefits and disservices of trees between rural and urban inhabitants.” This comment also applies to headings of Tables 6, 7, 8, and 9.
- Table 5 (line 280): The information that the first seven values per row that you report in Table 5 represent percentages should be included in the table. For example, you could write “%” in the row below “Definitely not” – “No” – “Rather no” – “Do not know” – “Rather yes” – “Yes” – “Absolutely yes”. An alternative would be to write it in the table caption. This comment also applies to Tables 6, 7, 8, and 9.
- Table 5 (line 280): For villagers the statement “Make urban environment more pleasant to live, work and spend leisure time.” is much more irrelevant than for urban dwellers. Maybe this is part of the explanation for the significant difference you find for the two groups. Do you discuss that in the discussion section?
- The sentence “Both villagers and city dwellers did not perceive trees as factors contributing to crime reduction or fear of crime.” (line 276-278): Isn’t this a coarse conclusion for the value distribution that you present in Table 5? To describe the results regarding crime reduction and fear of crime, I would rather use words such as “Most people...”.

- Results of Table 5: Would it make sense to mention the finding that for some statements (e.g., “Building stronger sense of community” and “Contributing to road accidents”) the responses are more homogeneously distributed than for the previously mentioned statements?
- The sentence of lines 293-294: Whether your finding is evident or not should rather be discussed in the discussion section than in the results part.
- Line 300: “category” instead of “group” when talking about statement categories? “Group” is confusing in this context, because you use this word already when you talk about your two respondent groups.
- Lines 301-302: I would prefer “...showed a statistically significant difference between rural and urban parents (Table 7)” instead of “...proved to be statistically significant when taking into consideration the attitudes of urban and rural parents (Table 7)”, because it is more precise, shorter, and avoids the word “proved”.
- Lines 303-304: Is a “when” missing between the words “yes” and “evaluating”?
- Line 311: I would prefer “Most respondents agree that...” instead of “In most cases, the respondents agree that...”, because it is shorter and more precise.
- The sentence of lines 318-321: Is something wrong with the sentence, especially with the part “as shown by options such as ‘rather not’ (village: 21.2%, city: 23.7%), ‘I do not know’ (village: 11.5%, city: 15.3%) and ‘rather yes’ (village: 28.8%, city: 13.6%)”? Can you find a better wording for your statement? For example: “The majority respondents do not feel the threat from trees with fragile branches. The most frequently chosen answer categories were ‘rather not’ (village: 21.2%, city: 23.7%), ‘I do not know’ (village: 11.5%, city: 15.3%) and ‘rather yes’ (village: 28.8%, city: 13.6%).”
- I do not understand the sentence in lines 321-322 (“This indicates a general lack of sense of absolute safety in this matter.”), because in the lines above (318-321) you describe your finding that people do not feel the threat from trees with fragile branches. Do you want to say that the reason for 28.8% and 13.6% of respondents (villagers and urban dwellers, respectively) saying “rather yes” to the “dropping-branches-item” may be a general lack of sense of absolute safety? If yes, can you find a more precise wording for this statement (lines 321-322) and shift it to the discussion part? Whatever your results may indicate should be discussed there and not in the results part, which should be devoid of speculation.
- Line 324: “category” instead of “group”?
- Line 324: If you use the words “no differences”, you should also name the objects between which no differences were found. For example, “No differences between resident groups were found for the items of the category of health benefits and disservices”.

- Line 324 and 317: In line 317, you talk about relationships between response behaviour and resident groups and in line 324 you use the word “differences” for the same thing. Can you be more consistent with your wording? Your purpose is to investigate differences, isn’t it? Then I would use this expression throughout the manuscript, except for the part in which you explain the method (data analysis subsection).
- Line 325: I would prefer “Most respondents agree with the statement that...” instead of “Respondents in most cases agree with the statement that...”, because it’s shorter and more precise.
- Lines 337-338: I would avoid the word “provided” and I would either use “difference” or “statistically significant difference” rather than “statistically difference”. For example: “Only one statement from the category of aesthetic disservices of trees was differently evaluated by urban and rural parents (Table 9)”.

4.2. Preferences towards outdoor activity of children

- Lines 351-357: What is the source of the statements you make in these lines? Can you provide the reader with the references (to tables or literature)? Is this a conclusion/ interpretation of your results or a summary of previous findings? Then it shouldn’t be part of the results section.
- Lines 363-364: I do not like the wording “This statement does not agree with...”. One alternative would be (although one should not start a sentence with numbers): “15.4% of rural and 30.6% of urban residents do not agree with this statement.” Another alternative would be that you combine this statement with the previous sentence: “Some people have no opinion on this subject (village: 26.9%, city: 13.6%) and others do not agree with this statement (15.4% of rural and 30.6% of urban residents).”
- The sentence of lines 365-367: In my opinion, the sentence needs a new wording, because “The p-value for the question...”, “amounted to”, and “which means that the result is on the verge of finding a correlation” sound strange to me. Would this be an alternative: “We found a nearly statistically significant difference between rural and urban parents’ responses to the question ‘Do you try to protect children from trees?’.”
- Line 368: In my opinion the wording “divided opinions” is too strong for the values you describe here. How would you like the following alternative sentence: “The biggest differences between urban and rural parents with regard to responses to this question were found for the ‘totally no’ option (village: 3.8%, city: 23.7%) and the ‘yes’ option (village: 21.2%, city: 8.5%).”
- The sentence of lines 369-370: This is a conclusion which should be part of the discussion instead of the results section.

- Line 372, Table 10: Can you provide a content-related meaningful heading for this table and avoid the wording “Statistical results...”? For example, “Differences between urban and rural parents with regard to approaches to children’s play in natural surroundings”
- Lines 377-379: In my opinion, replacing the two sentences of lines 377-379 by the following would be shorter, more comprehensive and precise: “Rural and urban parents differed in their evaluations of the [or: agreements to] the statement ‘[Trees are] causing danger on playgrounds’ ($p=0.006$).” Alternatively: “Rural parents stronger agreed to the statement ‘[Trees are] causing danger on playgrounds’ compared to urban parents ($p=0.006$).”
- Line 381: In my opinion, “The results indicate that people living...” would sound better than “It can be noticed that people living...”.
- Line 383: In my opinion, “Most respondents agree that...” would be more correct than “Respondents in most cases...”.
- Why is the sentence of lines 388-390 in bold?

5 Discussion

- In my opinion, the argumentation of lines 394-400 should rather be part of the introduction than of the discussion. I recommend starting the discussion with words such as “In our study we found that...”.
- Line 400: What review?
- Lines 403-404: In my opinion, “The survey revealed that urban and rural parents had similar views on the presence of trees...” would be more precise than “The survey revealed a common view on the presence of trees...”.
- Lines 404: Why “Interestingly...”? In what way is your finding surprising?
- Lines 404-405: In my opinion, “For most attitudes regarding trees, we did not find differences between urban and rural parents.” Would be more precise than “Interestingly, the place of residence did not have a significant impact on the results.”. The wording I suggest accounts for the fact that you found differences between respondents for a few attitudes.
- Can you provide a reference for the statement you make in lines 405-406?
- Line 406: In my opinion, you can delete the word “such”.
- Line 406: I would prefer “individual background characteristics” instead of “socio-economic” when you choose a generic term for age, education level, and affluence.
- Line 408: “awareness” of what?
- Line 408: “have been found to be correlated with the results.” Is unclear to me. Is the following what you want to say: “have been found to affect attitudes towards trees.”?

- Lines 408-453: You should describe other researchers' findings in the introduction. In your discussion you should say whether and in what way your findings correspond to or don't correspond to previous findings and how this may be explained. So, I would move the whole paragraph to the introduction.
- Line 410-411: "... but age, education, income, and perception [or: evaluation; or: preference] of vegetation in general affected attitudes towards trees" instead of "but certain socio-economic criteria differentiated the results. There was a correlation between age, education, income and attitude towards vegetation."
- Line 412: Can "becomes stronger" be replaced by a different wording without repeating "increases"? For example, "rises"?
- Lines 412-413: "education level" instead of "higher level of education".
- Line 413: "A similar survey..." instead of "Similar survey..."
- Lines 413-414: "A similar survey conducted in Morelia, a city in west-central Mexico with 597,511 residents, demonstrated that..." instead of "Similar survey conducted in Morelia with a population of 597,511 residents located in west-central Mexico demonstrated that..."
- Lines 416-419: You should include that it is the opinion of people regarding trees you are presenting. For example, "The study shows that people simultaneously agree that trees in urban areas cause damage (accidents and damaged infrastructure) and offer a lot of benefits (oxygen supply and shade). Overall, respondents agree that there should be more trees in the city [60]."
- Lines 419-421: I would prefer: "A survey on perception of public green space at the Vistula riverfront conducted in 2015 in Warsaw with 630 respondents revealed that people appreciated trees in the city but also showed a consumptive approach to the greenery." instead of "A survey conducted in 2015 in Warsaw on 630 respondents regarding public green space at the Vistula riverfront indicated that people appreciated trees in the city but also showed a consumptive approach to the greenery." However, my suggested sentence is still quite long.
- Line 427: "provide" instead of "give"?
- Line 427: "The study with..." instead of "The study of..."?
- I do not understand the sentence in lines 429-430. Is "trade-off between" or "balance between" more correct here instead of "association"?
- Can you find a more comprehensive wording for the sentence of lines 431-433? For example, by using expressions such as "on the one hand... on the other hand", "simultaneously" or "twofold point of view". "Trade-off between" or "balance between" rather than "association"?

- Line 433: In my opinion, starting a sentence with “Nor” is uncommon. Isn’t it only used in combination with “neither”? Can you find a different wording for this sentence?
- Line 435: “distrust” in what? “Management”?
- Line 436: Isn’t this a duplicate: “need for security, for people to feel safe”? How would this alternative be: “This may be explained by people’s need to feel safe in their backyards.”?
- Line 408-453: Please avoid presenting that much detail of other than your research in your discussion. It should rather be (in a shortened, less detailed version) part of the introduction.
- Can you find a more comprehensive wording for the sentence of lines 436-439? Can you start a new sentence after “abound”?
- The statement of lines 439-440 (“On the other hand, a partitioned view of the world does not necessarily mean that trees and forests are not valued...”): Isn’t this obvious? Isn’t one part of the view that people value trees and forests?
- The sentence in lines 442-446 is much too long and uneasy to understand. Can you find a more comprehensive wording for it and divide the sentence into few sentences? In my opinion, when referring to previous research it is not necessary to provide the reader with that much detail, e.g., where and when the respective study was conducted, the number of respondents etc. In the discussion you should discuss your findings in the light of previous research and how your results may be applied in planning practice.
- Line 446: What do you mean by “intrinsic detail”?
- What does the sentence in line 449 mean?
- Line 450: “Surveys articulate” sounds uncommon to me. Would “Farmers articulate” be better?
- Line 452: “distrust” in what?
- Lines 452-453: Isn’t this a duplicate: “need for security, for people to feel safe”? How would this alternative be: “This may be explained by people’s need to feel safe in their backyards.”? You made this statement already in line 436.
- Line 454: I would use past tense throughout the manuscript when you talk about your own results and present tense when describing other research. For example, “showed” instead of “show”.
- Line 455: “less” than who?
- Line 456-483: I do not see how your study and findings justify such a long digression in the discussion on how and why outdoor play has changed within the past generations.
- Lines 484-492: Please avoid long summaries of other research in the discussion. What did you find out? How does this match with previous research? What do you conclude

from that? What's the message you want to say? What does the similar response behaviour of rural and urban trees with regard to trees mean for urban and landscape planners? Why is the response behaviour similar between the two respondent groups? What may explain the differences you found? Can you try to be more concise and focus on the main points you want to make?

- The previous comment also applies to lines 439-541. Maybe a solution could be to clearly state in the introduction that you aim at answering your research question by a literature review and an own study. Then, in the results part, you present your findings and – if possible – a categorisation of previous findings. This categorisation should provide a structured overview of research (and not too much detail). The discussion should include the points I wrote in the previous comment. Would this be possible and work out?

6 Conclusions

- Line 546: “regarding” instead of “as regards”?
- Lines 546-547: Can the part of the sentence “The small variations in the collected data...” be deleted? I do not see that this is necessary and it is clear that you are talking about a difference you found here.
- Line 550: Can you avoid two times “large” in short distance?
- Conclusion in general: Your conclusion is much more written in a way how I would a discussion expect to be.
- Line 550: “regarding” instead of “as regards”?
- Why is the sentence in lines 551-553 in bold?
- Line 553: “empathy for trees” sounds strange to me. I would prefer “... have a more positive opinion towards trees...” or “...have a more positive attitude towards trees...”.
- Line 555: “visiting public places” or “using public places” instead of “staying in public places”?
- Line 555: No hyphen between “also” and “pay”.
- Line 557: I would prefer changing the word order: “visually unattractive” instead of “unattractive visually”.
- Line 562: Would “...danger [or threat] posed by trees for their children...” be better than “danger from trees to their children”?
- The sentence in lines 564-567: Can you shorten it?
- Line 564: “Against the background of” instead of “Considering”?
- Line 564: “sedentary behaviour” is a new aspect which should haven been taken up earlier when you mention it here in the conclusions.

- Line 564: “prevalence” instead of “occurrence”?
- Line 565: “contributes to” instead of “provides to”.
- The sentence in lines 567-568: I do not understand the last part of that sentence: Isn't it contradictory to the results you present in table 10 (you found that most people disagree to the statement that trees cause danger on playgrounds)? Why is the sentence in bold?
- Lines 569-570: I would prefer: “For most attitudes towards trees, we did not find statistically significant differences between urban and rural parents.” instead of “In most cases, results show no statistically significant differences among the opinions of urban and rural parents about trees.”, because in my opinion it's more precise.
- The sentence in lines 570-571: “It is influenced by a similar structure of greenery of the selected settlement units.”: What do you refer to when using “It”?
- Line 572: Should the comma in line 572 be a dash instead?
- Line 573: “influencing forest area rates”. Would it be more correct to say that the two areas you mention (Białowieża and Vistula) constitute the largest (or most important) forested areas in Warsaw and its surroundings?
- Line 575-576: What do you mean with this last sentence of the conclusion? Can you describe how you get to this conclusion, what it means, and why it is important?
- Conclusion (and discussion) in general: What do your results mean for future research and for urban and landscape planners? Why is your research important and what can the knowledge you gained be used for? What are the limitations of your study and what are further research gaps for future research (this should be part of the discussion)? Can you formulate an outlook for future research and finish with the most important conclusion you draw from your work?