

Dear Reviewers,

First I would like to thank you for your time to review our manuscript. Your comments were very helpful and highly appreciated. Extensive changes and restructure was made, so as to deliver an updated manuscript of high quality. These parts are highlighted on the document. In the following pages you will find point-to-point responses to your comments.

Best regards,

The Authors

Reviewer 1

Are the methods adequately described?

Methods have been significantly reorganized, condensed, and sections have been differentiated further and additional sections added to improve clarity.

Are the results clearly presented?

Tables have been incorporated to improve clarity, and textual presentation of results amended to improve understanding.

The article is bogged down by the methods section, starting with the complicated and hard to follow explanation of the checklist adaptation.

This has been amended – please, see explanation above

Figures and tables are needed to explain the highly descriptive section on the features of each setting.

Tables added and percentages incorporated to facilitate description of the results. Textual changes made and truncation of some sections to also reduce complexity.

I am concerned that the time lag between the UK case and the others has not been fully addressed; there should be a temporal comparison in addition to the geographic comparison.

Temporal comparison has been incorporated that compares mental health facilities in England assessed at different timepoints, and all facilities using data from all countries.

Reviewer 2

Does the introduction provide sufficient background and include all relevant references?

Introduction has been amended and reduced.

Are the methods adequately described?

Methods have been significantly reorganized, condensed, and sections have been differentiated further and additional sections added to improve clarity.

Are the results clearly presented?

Tables have been incorporated to improve clarity, and textual presentation of results amended to improve understanding.

The third paragraph of the introduction is too long, starting from “the aim of this paper...” there could be a new paragraph.

The overall size of the Introduction has been reduced and we believe improves the focus of the paper.

Intro 3rd paragraph: The sentence starting “The second UK sample...” is hard to read, not clear.

The paragraph has been removed and aspects modified and incorporated within the Methods section.

Section 2.1 – Provide the definition of GJ in the first use of the abbreviation. Is that stand for Gabrielle Jenkin?

We have clarified within the manuscript where the abbreviation refers to an author.

Be consistent in the use of “Co-I” or “Co-Investigator” in the paper.

These terms have been excluded from the manuscript.

You might consider sharing some of the sample (section 2.1) info with a table or a figure. It’s a very monotonous section and hard to keep the audience’s attention.

Tables have been incorporated, and results condensed, and substantive textual changes that we hope improves the clarity and reduces the monotony of some of the sections.

What is HBN 35?

This is Health Building Note 35 and has now been clarified within the manuscript.

Section 2.2 Is methodology mixed-method, qualitative, or quantitative? Architectural tool & checklist are the tools that you developed in your methodology. Please clarify your methodology.

We have incorporated within the section ‘Materials and Methods’ a subsection ‘Analyses of domestic and institutional features within, between and across all countries’, which we believe has improved the clarity of the methodology.

Please add an in-text citation for Robinson's study in all applicable places.

Done, thank you.

You don’t have subsection 2.2.2 and please reconsider the structure of section 2.2.

Section 2.2 has been restructured to improve clarity, in addition to substantive modification of the 'Materials and Methods' section.

Is it possible to add a sample of the Robinson checklist again it's long and monotonous information? Hard to grasp the checklist.

Some data has also been presented within a Table that we hope improves understanding of the some of the features within the checklist. The Results section has also been substantially modified, and condensed to reduce monotony and improve clarity.

Robinson's list is from the US. Did you consider cultural differences between Robinson's list and yours?

This is not applicable as Robinson's checklist was for residential premises and this is for in-patient healthcare facilities. The comparison of the checklist is in reference to neighbouring buildings rather than a specific typology.

In the findings, please use some tables and figures. It's hard to follow quantitative info in a text format. And table 1 percentages would give a better idea to the audience instead of a number of features.

Percentages have been added to Table 1, and the number of Tables has increased to aid understanding of these data.

You can represent averages in a separate table which will give a better idea to compare the findings within countries.

The current modification of Table 1 now facilitates ease of comparison.

You represent your findings in two main categories: spaces and countries. Your findings are descriptive with only percentages. It is expected to see some relation analysis in-between space distribution vs countries. Not only cross-country comparisons. Again these comparisons would be more meaningful in a table or figure.

Due to the detail of the information provided within the paper, and incorporation of additional analyses by time period, we have focused on these aspects so as not to over complicate the manuscript.

"A more extensive use of" Incomplete sentence.

The sentence has been amended.

Please do proofread the paper, there are missing letters in words and typos.

This has been undertaken, and amendments made.

This is a good topic that will potentially lead to several future studies. I hope my review helps to improve the quality of the study. Thank you.

Thank you.

Reviewer 3

The abstract should highlight the relevance of this research in the last few lines.

Abstract has been amended

The introduction should have one last paragraph stating that why this study results are important and valid for the aims and scope of International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, considering it is a peer-reviewed scientific journal that publishes original articles, critical reviews, research notes, and short communications in the interdisciplinary area of environmental health sciences and public health. The authors need to highlight the application of this research and why their findings are relevant in context of public health.

Added to Introduction and minor modification to aims to make clearer.

In the current stage, the abstract appears as only a summary of their results.

Added above to abstract.

The results are depicted as Tables. Some kind of patient history and statistical relevance of these findings should be added either in main figures or supplementary figures.

We have amended these data to facilitate statistical comparison should the reader wish to do so.

We have stated within the manuscript that the patients within these facilities would be within the acute spectrum psychiatric illness.

A pie chart or any form of graph showing comparative analysis of subjects or studies from different European countries can be put across if some measurement factors are statistically different.

Given the small number of facilities, and the potential multiple comparisons possible, we have limited presentation of these data in Table 1 to that which could facilitate statistical comparison of frequencies by categories within the mental health checklist.

Secondly, a pictorial or graphical representation of the most quantitative, statistically relevant, influencing factor can be highlighted across the non-influencing factor. It summarises the table in a more reader friendly manner.

Incorporate Table of common factors.