

The outdoor thermal benchmarks in Melbourne urban climate

Inji Kenawy*

i.m.kenawy@salford.ac.uk

Hisham Elkadi

School of the Built Environment, University of Salford, United Kingdom

▀ Corresponding author at: Maxwell Building, School of the Built Environment, University of Salford, Manchester, M5 4WT, United Kingdom.

Abstract

Outdoor thermal comfort significantly influences the users' experience in urban places; affecting their extent of usage. The paper aims to identify the outdoor thermal benchmarks for the temperate oceanic (Cfb) climate zones in Australia. It examines the perception of thermal comfort in two urban places in Melbourne city. Field measurements were conducted during summer and winter seasons along with 2123 valid questionnaires and observations in both contexts. Micrometeorological parameters were measured and used to calculate the mean radiant temperature and the physiological equivalent temperature (PET). The questionnaire provided information regarding the thermal sensations and preferences of the users using ASHRAE seven-point and McIntyre scales respectively. The quantitative analysis is used to calculate the range of outdoor thermal comfort in Melbourne. This was ranged between 20 °C and 25 °C PET. Additionally, the neutral and preferred temperature were found to be 20.4 °C and 19.2 °C respectively. Variations in different benchmarks were observed with different seasons and types of urban places. The results endorse the significant impact of thermal adaptation factors on the users' comfort levels and acceptability for micrometeorological environments. The findings also identify the different thermal benchmarks that help urban designers creating comfortable outdoor places within the oceanic temperate climatic zones.

Keywords

Outdoor thermal comfort; Temperate oceanic climatic zone (Cfb); Thermal comfort ranges; Thermal adaptation; Physiological equivalent temperature.

1 Introduction

Designing thermally comfortable outdoor places has proven to be a significant factor for the extent of their success; influencing the users' attendance and positive behaviour (Aljawabra & Nikolopoulou, 2010; Eliassona, Knez, Westerbergb, Thorssona, & Lindberga, 2007). Previous research showed how micrometeorological conditions influence the participation of users in outdoor places during different seasons. In USA and Canada, the participation of users in the outdoor places represented an average of 10% and 3% during summer and winter respectively (Leech, Burnett, Nelson, & Aaron, 2000). Being challenged by several variables, outdoor thermal comfort (OTC) studies have been characterised by its complexity. Many attempts took place to identify the different factors affecting OTC sensation (Chen & Ng, 2012). Micrometeorological parameters are the most apparent variables responsible for thermal sensation in outdoor places. However, the expansive variation between objective micrometeorological measurements and subjective human thermal sensation votes suggested significant effects of physical, physiological and psychological adaptation (Nikolopoulou & Steemers, 2003). Besides these factors, outdoor places have a lower control over micrometeorological parameters, which adds to this complexity. Understanding the OTC ranges of users is, therefore, a valuable tool for urban designers that enriches the design possibilities by creating comfortable outdoor public places, and accordingly, increase their success rate and contribute to the sustainability of cities (Cheung & Jim, 2017). Previous research attempted to identify OTC ranges in places with different geographical and micrometeorological characteristics including parks (Kántor & Unger, 2010; Lam, Loughnan, &

Tapper, 2018; Mahmoud, 2011; S Thorsson, Lindqvist, & Lindqvist, 2004), urban squares (da Silveira Hirashima, de Assis, & Nikolopoulou, 2016), streets (Holst & Mayer, 2011; Lee, Holst, & Mayer, 2013; Mayer, Holst, Dostal, Imbery, & Schindler, 2008) and university campuses (Salata, Golasi, de Lieto Vollaro, & de Lieto Vollaro, 2016; Shooshtarian & Ridley, 2016; Xi, Li, Mochida, & Meng, 2012). As Chen and Ng (2012) identified modelling and empirical methods are the two main approaches used in assessing OTC. The empirical method prevails due to relying on detailed analysis for both objective micrometeorological parameters affecting thermal comfort and subjective assessments of users. Research on subjective thermal comfort perception generally employs questionnaires as the main data collection tool. The number of respondents to the questionnaires in previous OTC studies varied widely from eight to 7851 (Liu, Zhang, & Deng, 2016; Salata et al., 2016); as does the duration of field surveys from one day to two years. However, as Salata et al. stated (2016), summer and winter were the most frequently investigated seasons. Different scales were used for respondents to specify their thermal sensation votes. ASHRAE 7 points scale (cold, cool, slightly cool, neutral, slightly warm, warm, hot) is the most commonly employed (Lin, 2009; Lin, de Dear, & Hwang, 2011; Ng & Cheng, 2012; Pantavou, Theoharatos, Santamouris, & Asimakopoulos, 2013; Salata et al., 2016; Yang, Wong, & Jusuf, 2013; Yang, Wong, & Zhang, 2013). However, few studies used the 5 points scale (very cold, cool, neutral, warm, very hot) (Nikolopoulou, Baker, & Steemers, 2001) and the 9 points scale (very cold, cold, cool, slightly cool, neutral, slightly warm, warm, hot, very hot) (Kántor, Égerházi, & Unger, 2012; Liu et al., 2016; Yahia & Johansson, 2013). To identify thermal preferences, the McIntyre (1980) scale ranging from cooler (-1), no change (0) to warmer (+1) preferences is used (Cheng, Ng, Chan, & Givoni, 2012; Lin, 2009; Lin et al., 2011; Salata et al., 2016; Yang, Wong, & Jusuf, 2013). Different rational thermal comfort models were employed in outdoor settings. Chen and Ng (2012) explained that to have a significant effect on planning

practice, these models are to be supported by both human-biometeorological and physiological information. The indexes were originally dependant on the energy fluxes between the human body and the environment. The Predicted Mean Vote Index (PMV), Effective Temperature (ET in °C), and Standard Effective Temperature (SET* in °C) (Fanger, 1982; Gagge, Fobelets, & Berglund, 1986); are examples of indexes originally developed for indoor thermal comfort studies and were later adapted to be applied in outdoor settings (Cheng et al., 2012; Nikolopoulou et al., 2001; S Thorsson et al., 2004). The Outdoor Standard Effective Temperature (OUT_SET* in °C) (Spagnolo & de-Dear, 2003) and the Physiological Equivalent Temperature (PET in °C) (Mayer & Höppe, 1987) are thermo-physiological assessment variables that were purposely designed for outdoor settings. PET is the most predominant thermal comfort index used in the OTC studies (da Silveira Hirashima et al., 2016; Elnabawi, Hamza, & Dudek, 2016; Holst & Mayer, 2011; Kántor, Égerházi, et al., 2012; Lee et al., 2013; Lee & Mayer, 2018; Lee, Mayer, & Chen, 2016; Lee, Mayer, & Schindler, 2014; Lin & Matzarakis, 2008; Lin, 2009; Liu et al., 2016; Mayer et al., 2008; Ng & Cheng, 2012; Salata et al., 2016; Yang, Wong, & Zhang, 2013).

The most commonly used benchmarks to identify OTC are neutral PET (NPET), preferred PET (PPET), thermal acceptability range (TAR), and neutral PET range (NPETR). As observed by Cheung and Jim (2017), different methods are used to define and calculate those benchmarks. NPET is widely expressed as the temperature arising from neutral thermal sensation (Fanger, 1982). The linear regression, quadratic regression and the probit analysis are three different methods used in calculating NPET. As determined by Kántor, Kovács, and Takács (2016), these different techniques led to significant variations in the NPET values. The linear regression between mean thermal sensation votes (MTSV) and PET is the most widely used method in calculating NPET in similar studies (Chen, Wen, Zhang, & Xiang, 2015; Cohen, Potchter, & Matzarakis, 2013; Elnabawi et al.,

2016; Kántor, Égerházi, et al., 2012; Lin & Matzarakis, 2008; Lin, 2009; Mahmoud, 2011; Salata et al., 2016; Yang, Wong, & Zhang, 2013). Although this method was criticized by assuming that thermal sensation votes are continuous instead of ordinal data (Cheung & Jim, 2017), this impact was found to be insignificant (Salata et al., 2016). Few studies used the same method having the linear regression using different other thermal comfort indexes (Pantavou et al., 2013; Yang, Wong, & Jusuf, 2013; Zhao, Zhou, Li, He, & Chen, 2016). PPET is the ultimate temperature in which the probabilities of users' preferences towards having warmer and cooler changes are equivalent. To calculate PPET, a probit regression analysis for both warmer and cooler preferences is modelled and the intersection of both corresponds to the preferred temperature (Lin, 2009; Lin et al., 2011; Salata et al., 2016; Yang, Wong, & Jusuf, 2013; Yang, Wong, & Zhang, 2013; Zhao et al., 2016). TAR is the limit determining the temperature accepted by 80 or 90% of the respondents (ASHRAE, 2004). This range is generated from a quadratic regression between the thermal acceptability of the respondents and the temperature. Yang, Wong, and Jusuf (2013) calculated this range based on the assumption that 80% acceptability rate corresponds to the value of ± 0.85 MTSV in the linear regression between the binned MTSV and the temperature as per ISO-7730 (2005). NPETR corresponds to the values ranging from -0.5 to +0.5 MTSV in the NPET linear regression (Chen et al., 2015; Kántor et al., 2016; Lai, Guo, Hou, Lin, & Chen, 2014; Liu et al., 2016; Salata et al., 2016). Different benchmarks obtained in similar OTC studies are summarised in Table 1, showing that the NPET is the most commonly used and the NPETR values are the least reported.

This paper aims to identify the different outdoor thermal comfort benchmarks for Melbourne city representing the temperate Oceanic climatic zone in Australia, adopting the most commonly used methods in OTC studies, to help ultimately urban designers and urban planners in designing comfortable outdoor public places.

Place	Koppen classification	Season	Urban place	Micrometeorological measurements	responses	Scale	Index	N PET	P PET	TAR	NPET R
Singapore, Singapore (Yang, Wong, & Zhang, 2013)	Tropical rainforest (Af)	August to May	13 urban spaces (parks, squares, streets, campuses and quay)	Air temperature (Ta), globe temperature (Tg), relative humidity (RH), wind speed (V), Vapour pressure (VP), & global radiation (G)	2020 valid	ASHRAE 7 pts	PET	√	√	√	
Singapore, Singapore (Yang, Wong, & Jusuf, 2013)	Af	Aug. to May	13 urban spaces	Ta, Tg, RH, V & G	2036 valid	ASHRAE 7 pts	OT	√	√	√	
Belo Horizonte, Brazil (da Silveira Hirashima et al., 2016)	Tropical wet (Aw)	Summer & winter	Urban squares	Ta, Tg, RH, & V	1693	Other 7 pts	PET	√	√	√	
Damascus, Syria (Yahia & Johansson, 2013)	Semi-arid cool (Bsk)	Summer & winter	2 types of residential areas and parks	Ta, Tg, RH, V & wind direction (WD)	920	9 pts	PET OUTSET	√	-	√	-
Cairo, Egypt (Elnabawi et al., 2016)	Hot arid (Bwh)	Summer & winter	Street	Ta, Tg, RH, V & solar radiation (SR)	320	ASHRAE 7 pts	PET	√	√	√	-
Shanghai, China (Chen et al., 2015)	Humid Sub-tropical (Cfa)	Autumn & winter	Urban park	Ta, Tg, RH, V & G	596	ASHRAE 7 pts	PET	-	-	√	√
Guangzhou, China (Li, Zhang, & Zhao, 2016)	Cfa	Summer, winter & spring	4 residential communities (resting areas)	Ta, Tg, RH, V & G	1005	9 pts	PET	√	√	√	-
Guangzhou, China (Zhao et al., 2016)	Cfa	Aug. - mid-Oct.	University	Ta, Tg, RH, V & G	1582	ASHRAE 7 pts	SET*	√	√	√	
Changsha, China (Liu et al., 2016)	Cfa	All year	6 typical public spaces	Ta, Tg, RH, & V	7851 valid	9 pts	PET	√	-	-	√
Changsha, China (Yang, Wong, & Zhang, 2013)	Cfa	June to Aug.	17 urban spaces (parks, squares, streets & campuses)	Ta, Tg, RH, V, VP & G	2052	ASHRAE 7 pts	PET	√	√	√	-
Sydney, Australia (Spagnolo & de-Dear, 2003)	Cfa	Summer & winter	Outdoor and semi outdoor places	Ta, RH, V, short & long wave radiation fluxes (K and L)	1018	ASHRAE 7 pts	OT, ET*, OUTSET*, PET	√	√	-	-
Sun moon lake, Taiwan (Lin & Matzarakis, 2008)	Cfa	All year	Touristic area	Ta, Tg, RH, V & G	1644	ASHRAE 7 pts	PET	√	-	√	-
Szeged, Hungary (Kántor, Égerházi, et al., 2012;	Temperate Warm (Cfb)	Autumn & Spring	2 urban squares	Ta, RH, V, K and L	967	9 pts	PET	√	-	√	√

Kántor, Unger, & Gulyás, 2012)												
Szeged, Hungary (Kántor et al., 2016)	Cfb	Spring, summer & autumn	6 recreational areas	Ta, RH, V, K and L	5805 valid	9 pts	PET	√	√		√	
Melbourne, Australia (Shooshtarian & Rajagopalan, 2017; Shooshtarian & Ridley, 2017)	Cfb	Spring, summer & autumn	University campus	Ta, Tg), RH, V and G	1023 valid	ASHRAE 7 pts	PET	√	√	√	-	
Athens, Greece (Pantavou et al., 2013)	Hot dry summer (Csa)	All year	3 places (square, street, & region)	Ta, Tg), RH, V, SR and G	1706	ASHRAE 7 pts	UTCI	√	-	√	-	
Tel Aviv, (Cohen et al., 2013)	Csa	Summer & winter	3 places (parks, street & square)	Ta, RH, V, WD and G	1731	9 pts	PET	√	-	√	-	
Rome, Italy (Salata et al., 2016)	Csa	Feb. to Jan.	Sapienza University campus	Ta, Tg , RH, V and G	941 valid	ASHRAE 7 pts	PET	√	√		√	
Taichung, Taiwan (Lin, 2009)	Dry-winter humid sub-tropical (Cwa)	Apr. to Feb. (hot & cool)	Public square	Ta, Tg, RH, V and G	505	ASHRAE 7 pts	PET	√	√	√		
Tianjin, China (Lai et al., 2014)	Hot summer continental (Dwa)	March to Jan.	Park	Ta, Tg, RH, V and G	1585	ASHRAE 7 pts	PMV, PET, UTCI	-	-	-	√	

Table 1 Different methods and results from similar OTC studies

1 2 Study area

2 Melbourne city is situated between latitude 37°49'' south and longitude 144°58 '' east of Australia
3 having a total area of 9990.5 km². The climatic conditions in Melbourne city are within the
4 temperate climate group (cfb) according to the widely used Köppen- Geiger climatic classification,
5 having uniform precipitation distribution and warm summers. The summary of major climate
6 statistics recorded at Melbourne Regional Office (latitude: 37.81° S, longitude 144.97° E, elevation
7 31m) from the year 1855 to 2015 shows that the mean air temperature lies between minimum and
8 maximum of 13°C and 26°C during summer and between 6°C and 15°C during winter as shown in
9 Fig. 1. The mean rainfall recorded during the same period ranged between 47 mm and 66 mm
10 during January and October respectively. The mean daily sunshine varied between 4 h to 9 h in June
11 and January respectively. The relative humidity at 9:00 am and 3:00 pm were also noted to have a
12 minimum of 62% (October and December), and 47% (December and January) and a maximum of
13 80% (June) and 63% (June) respectively. The wind speed in the same conditions was documented
14 with a value of minimum 2.4 (April) and 3.5 m/s (May) and a maximum of 3.5 (October) and 4.4 m/s
15 (September) for both 9 am and 3 pm respectively (BOM, 2017). According to the Beaufort comfort
16 scale for wind speed, these values range from the light breeze to gentle breeze, which is relatively
17 comfortable (Burberry, 1997).




Figure 1 Mean monthly air temperature and humidity in Melbourne (1855_2015)
Source: The authors based on (BOM, 2017)

18

19 The study was employed in two different types of urban places; the Federation square and Deakin
 20 University’s Burwood campus; having different functions, activities, urban characteristics, as well as
 21 the frequency of visits. The distance between the two study areas is 14.5 km. As per Gehl (2011)
 22 classification to urban places, Federation square represents places where optional and social
 23 activities take place, which require a higher quality and accordingly better climatic comfort levels.
 24 Conversely, Burwood campus exemplifies places where necessary activities are more dominant
 25 where less quality could be tolerated.

26 *2.1 Federation square*

27 Federation square is a main attraction in the Central Business District (CBD) of Melbourne. A total
 28 area of 3.2 ha situated in the intersection of two key linear paths having the ability to accommodate
 29 15000 people at one time. The square is surrounded by key buildings including the National Gallery
 30 of Victoria, cafes and restaurants providing different activities for their visitors. Having this unique
 31 location facilitates its role as a place for people to gather, a landmark for tourists to visit as well as a
 32 spot for public activities events that are frequently organised. The flooring in Federation square is

33 mainly paved with sandstone cobblestones. Concrete and bluestone also cover few parts of the
34 square and green infrastructure is very limited (Fig. 2a).

35 2.2 Deakin Burwood campus

36 Burwood campus is the largest campus for Deakin University accommodating around 20800
37 undergraduate and postgraduate students. It is located around 15 km from Melbourne CBD.
38 Facilities in the campus include art collection and galleries, bookshop, childcare, library, sports
39 centre, lecture theatres, computer labs, medical centre and counselling services, multi-faith prayer
40 rooms as well as on-campus accommodation. This field study took place in the main gathering area
41 for students in the central courtyard located between the library, learning spaces, food outlet and
42 student life department from the north, south, east and west sides respectively. The campus is
43 mainly paved with concrete and has numerous green areas (Fig. 2b).



44 **Figure 2 Studied urban places (a) Federation square (b) Burwood campus**
Source: (Melbourne-for-the-visitor, 2017; Rushwright-associates, 2017)

45 3 Material and methods

46 This empirical study applied both objective field measurements and subjective assessments of
47 human perceptions (Fig. 3). Field measurements describing the micrometeorological conditions for
48 studied places were employed simultaneously with structured questionnaires and observations for

49 examining human thermal sensation. As recommended by Ng and Cheng (2012), meteorological
 50 measurements were distanced within a maximum of three meters from questionnaires'
 51 respondents. The results of both objective and subjective examination were correlated to identify
 52 the outdoor thermal requirements of users. The data were collected during summer between
 53 January and February 2013 and 2014 and during winter from July to August 2013 and 2014 from
 54 9:00 am to 5:00 pm to examine different micrometeorological conditions. In Federation square,
 55 both weekdays and weekends were included to have a comprehensive assessment for the different
 56 days. However, in Burwood campus, due to its functional character, only weekdays during teaching
 57 periods were considered. Rainy days were excluded from both case studies.




Figure 3 Selected methods chart

58 **3.1 Microclimatic objective measurements:**

59 **3.1.1 Field measurements**

60 As per previous studies, the recorded micrometeorological parameters in this study are the ambient
 61 air temperature (T_a in $^{\circ}\text{C}$), relative humidity (RH in %), wind speed (V in m/s), solar radiation (R_a in
 62 w/s^2) and globe temperature (T_g in $^{\circ}\text{C}$) used in calculating the mean radiant temperature (T_{mrt})
 63 (Chen et al., 2015; Cheng et al., 2012; Krüger, Drach, Emmanuel, & Corbella, 2013; Lai et al., 2014;
 64 Li et al., 2016; Pantavou et al., 2013; Salata et al., 2016). Additional micrometeorological parameters

65 were obtained from the nearby Melbourne (Olympic Park) weather station (such as cloud cover and
66 water vapour pressure) . The weather station is 8 m above sea level and located 2 and 10.4 km away
67 from Federation square and Burwood campus respectively.

68 The Mobile Architecture and Built Environment Laboratory (Mabel) thermal comfort carts were
69 used in monitoring micrometeorological parameters for their high accuracy and mobility during the
70 field visit. The comfort carts are designed to assess thermal environments according to the
71 procedures and protocols prescribed in ASHRAE's thermal comfort standard- ASHRAE 55-92R and
72 ISO 7726 Ergonomics of the thermal environment - Instruments for measuring physical quantities
73 (ISO, 2002). Each cart measures the micrometeorological parameters simultaneously at four
74 heights. The LO, MID, HI and HEAD heights measure at 0.1, 0.6, 1.1 and 1.7 m above the floor
75 respectively. The LO, MID, and HI heights correspond to the ankles, waist, and head of a seated
76 person respectively; and the HEAD height corresponds to the head of a standing person. The (T_a)
77 and (T_g) are monitored through two temperature probes at the LO, MID and HI heights. One
78 thermocouple exists at the HEAD level for (T_a) measurements. The accuracy of the three OMEGA
79 44032 linear thermistors that recorded both (T_a) and (T_g) was 0.1 °C. A HyCal integrated humidity
80 sensor (IH-3605-B) were used to record relative humidity (RH) with 2% accuracy at MID height. A
81 polystyrene circular white disc protected both temperature and humidity sensors from direct sun
82 exposure. Digital TSI anemometers with omnidirectional hot wire type of anemometer probes were
83 monitoring (V) at the different heights. The anemometers were calibrated to meet the specified
84 measurement accuracy of 3 % of reading within the response time of 0.2 s. The heart of the system,
85 Campbell Scientific CR23X data logger, is a fully programmable data acquisition system that can run
86 MABEL carts in different operational modes enabling quick and efficient performance of cross-
87 sectional thermal comfort research (Fig. 4).

88 Another weather station was installed measuring T_a ; V and RH for cross-checking purposes. The
89 portable station was also used for the solar radiation. The
90 measuring device used was a Kipp and Zonen pyranometer for
91 global irradiance (Boland, Ridley, & Brown, 2008). The design
92 of the mobile meteorological station is consistent with other
93 meteorological devices used in past studies (Holst & Mayer,
94 2011; Lee et al., 2013; Lee et al., 2014; Helmut Mayer et al.,
95 2008; Ng & Cheng, 2012; Nikolopoulou & Steemers, 2003;
96 Spagnolo & de-Dear, 2003). The devices were all tested and calibrated before the survey and their
97 timing systems were synchronized with Melbourne standard time. During the field measurements,
98 the devices were allowed 10 -15 minutes response time before the actual recording. The comfort
99 carts were placed in both open sky and shaded area, and were programmed to record all measured
100 data at 1 and 15 min intervals automatically.

101 3.1.2 Thermal comfort index

102 Each questionnaire was associated with its corresponding micrometeorological measurements
103 taking into consideration its location and time. To assess thermal comfort levels, respondents'
104 thermal perception, preferences and acceptances are linked to the thermal comfort index
105 calculated from these micrometeorological parameters. As stated previously, PET is the most
106 commonly used and recommended index in OTC studies. It is the heat balance model of human
107 body based on Munich Energy-balance Model for Individuals (MEMI), and defined as the air
108 temperature in a typical indoor setting at which the heat balance of the human body is maintained
109 by skin temperature, core temperature, and sweat rate equal to those under the conditions to be
110 assessed (Höppe, 1999). PET is expressed in Celsius and assumes constant values of 0.9 CLO for



Figure 4 MABEL comfort cart

111 clothing and 80 W for metabolic rate. It is calculated in this study through Rayman software, version
112 1.2 (Lee & Mayer, 2016; Matzarakis, Rutz, & Mayer, 2007) using T_a (°C), RH (%), V (m/s), T_{mrt} (°C),
113 and cloud cover (octas) in addition to respondents' age and gender characteristics as input data
114 (Makaremi, Salleh, Jaafar, & GhaffarianHoseini, 2012).

115 3.1.3 The mean radiant temperature (T_{mrt})

116 Mean radiant temperature is defined as the 'uniform temperature of an imaginary enclosure in
117 which the radiant heat transfer from the human body equals the radiant heat transfer in the actual
118 non-uniform enclosure' (ASHRAE, 2001). The importance of T_{mrt} returns to its significant influence
119 on the energy balance and thermal comfort of the human body (Mayer & Höpfe, 1987; Spagnolo
120 & de-Dear, 2003). T_{mrt} is a critical factor used in calculating PET index. Using T_g in calculating T_{mrt}
121 reported a relatively small difference in accuracy when compared to other methods based on
122 integral radiation measurements and angular factor (Thorsson, Honjo, Lindberg, Eliasson, & Lim,
123 2007). Following similar research (Chen et al., 2015; Cheng et al., 2012; Krüger et al., 2013; Lai et al.,
124 2014; Li et al., 2016; Pantavou et al., 2013; Salata et al., 2016), T_{mrt} is calculated based on the
125 conversion of globe temperature data measured by the globe thermometer consisting of a
126 thermocouple wire held at the middle of a 38 mm diameter black table-tennis ball in the previously
127 specified comfort carts using Eq. (1) (Thorsson, Lindberg, Eliasson, & Holmer, 2007).

$$128 \quad T_{mrt} = \left(\frac{(T_g + 273)^4 + (1.1 \times 10^8 V a^{0.6})(T_g - T_a)}{\epsilon D^{0.4}} \right)^{1/4} - 273 \quad (1)$$

130
131 Where: D is globe diameter (m) (= 0.038 m in this study), and ϵ is emissivity (= 0.95 for black coloured
132 globe).

133 3.2 Human subjective assessment

134 3.2.1 Questionnaires & observations

135 The randomly distributed designed questionnaire was divided into three main parts starting with
136 the respondents' personal data including their age, gender, clothing, activities, etc. Clothing values
137 were calculated using the checklist used by Ng and Cheng (2012). Activities were converted into
138 metabolic rates of 1, 1.2, and 2 met for users' sitting, standing and walking respectively. Both
139 calculations were adopted from the ASHRAE standard 55 (2004) and ISO-7730 (1994). Respondents
140 were then required to indicate their thermal perception according to ASHRAE 7 points scale to
141 enable reliable comparisons of results with various OTC studies using the same scale. Thermal
142 acceptability and preferences using the McIntyre scale (cooler -1, no change 0 and warmer +1) were
143 also recorded. Additional data including time of response, the location of respondents in the place,
144 and sky conditions were simultaneously observed and filled with an observation sheet. Johansson,
145 Thorsson, Emmanuel, and Krüger (2014) suggested a range of 400 to 500 respondents to be a
146 reliable sample size for OTC studies. Using the equation developed by Cochran (2007), a minimum
147 of 118 respondents is calculated as an acceptable sample size for this study.

148 4 Results

149 4.1 Descriptive analysis

150 4.1.1 Respondents

151 A total of 2123 users responded to the questionnaires, which fulfils the sample size required for
152 generalisation. A balanced distribution of respondents was noted in both urban places and seasons
153 studied. The numbers of respondents in Federation square and Burwood campus were 1021 and
154 1102 respectively. During summer and winter, the respondents were 1146 and 977 respectively. A
155 variation in the pattern of usage and attendance could be noticed in Federation square in different

156 seasons during the weekdays and the weekends. The attendance on weekends during summer was
157 much higher than weekdays (1.8) while this percentage was almost similar during winter (1.2). This
158 ratio suggests that the micrometeorological conditions during summer are more encouraging for
159 users to visit outdoor public places to carry out their optional activities during weekends. The gender
160 distribution of the sample also indicated a slightly higher attendance of female in both places. The
161 total number of female to male is 567 to 454, and 665 to 437, in Federation square, and Burwood
162 campus respectively. To represent accurately the thermal sensation votes of respondents, the users
163 living in the city for less than 6 months as well as pregnant women were excluded (Salata et al.,
164 2016).

165 4.1.2 Micrometeorological measurements

166 The frequency of measured air temperature at both urban places varied from a minimum of 17.5°C
167 and 7.3°C and a maximum of 34.6°C and 18.4°C for summer and winter respectively. In Burwood
168 campus and Federation square the minimum values were 19.3°C and 9.5°C and the maximum
169 values were 28.8°C and 17°C for summer and winter respectively. According to the PET classification
170 values for temperate climate (Matzarakis, Mayer, & Isiomon, 1999), during summer these values
171 ranged from neutral to slightly warm at the Federation square, and from slightly cool to warm at
172 Burwood campus. During winter, the Federation square temperature ranged from slightly cool to
173 cool and Burwood campus temperature ranged from neutral to cold. As shown in Figure 5, Burwood
174 campus has a wider range of air temperature during both seasons.




Figure 5 The frequency of measured air temperature in Federation square (a) during summer, (b) during winter; and in Burwood campus (c) during summer and (d) during winter

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

The distribution of V, RH, and G are detailed in Table 2. According to the Beaufort comfort scale (Burberry, 1997), V values at the Federation square and Burwood campus during both seasons varied from calm to light breeze. These values represent very light wind only felt on exposed skins. RH varied from 8.4% to 84.5% during summer and from 41.5% to 95.7% during winter. RH values at Burwood campus tended to be lower and higher than in Federation square during summer and winter respectively. G during summer and winter in both places varied from 45 to 903 W/m² during summer and from zero to 513 W/m² during winter. Both the global and the diffuse radiation values during winter were noticeably less than during summer.


Place	Season	Wind Speed (m/s)		Relative Humidity (%)		Global Radiation (w/m ²)	
		Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
Federation square	Summer	0.15	0.7	31.5%	83%	45	903
	Winter	0.36	1.47	41.5%	66.3%	0	513
Burwood campus	Summer	0.3	2	8.4%	84.5%	328	879
	Winter	0.27	1.1	47.5%	95.7%	24.1	470.4

184

Table 2 Distribution of wind speed, relative humidity and radiation in Federation square and Burwood campus

185 4.1.3 Thermal sensation votes (TSV)

186 The TSV identifies the thermal perception of users
187 obtained from the ASHRAE scale in the
188 questionnaire (Fig. 6). A percentage of 14.7% of the
189 total respondents selected to feel thermally neutral
190 (TSV=0). The votes inclined towards the cold



191 **Figure 6 Distribution of thermal sensation votes during summer and winter**

191 (TSV<0) and warm (TSV>0) directions were 53% and

192 32.2% respectively. The frequency distribution of thermal sensation votes in the different seasons
193 showed an absolute skewness of -0.412 and +0.987 during summer and winter respectively. This
194 skewness is in line with the Micrometeorological measurements that ranged from warm (2) to cold
195 (-3) feeling according to the temperate regions' PET classification (Matzarakis et al., 1999).

196 4.2 Thermal comfort benchmarks

197 4.2.1 Neutral PET (NPET)

198 The NPET is retrieved from the linear regression (LR) between the mean thermal sensation votes
199 (MTSV) and the thermal comfort index (PET) calculated from the measured micrometeorological
200 data. Due to the significance of thermal adaptation, similar studies have determined the
201 respondents' MTSVs for each temperature interval with different bins width of 0.5°C, 1°C, 1.2°C and
202 2°C PET (da Silveira Hirashima et al., 2016; Kántor et al., 2016; T.-P. Lin & Matzarakis, 2008; Salata
203 et al., 2016; Shooshtarian & Ridley, 2017; Yang, Wong, & Zhang, 2013). This research determines
204 the MTSV for each 0.5°C PET intervals for more precision as per the framework of Yang, Wong, and
205 Zhang (2013). The fitted regression lines for the aggregated data, during summer, and winter are
206 represented by Eqs. (2), (3), and (4) respectively (Fig. 7). The significant correlation revealed a

207 powerful relationship between the two variables especially for the aggregated data having R^2 of
 208 0.919.

$$\text{MTSV} = 0.176 \text{ PET} - 3.584 \quad R^2 = 0.919, p < .001 \quad (2)$$

$$\text{MTSV} = 0.169 \text{ PET} - 3.381 \quad R^2 = 0.695, p < .001 \quad (3)$$

$$\text{MTSV} = 0.127 \text{ PET} - 3.101 \quad R^2 = 0.727, p < .001 \quad (4)$$

209
 210 By substituting $\text{MTSV}=0$ in Eq. (2), the value of the NPET was found to be 20.4°C . The values of NPET
 211 during summer and winter were calculated to be 20 and 24.4°C respectively. For Federation square
 212 and Burwood campus, their solved fitted equations attained NPETs of 19.9 and 20.7°C respectively.
 213 The higher NPET at Burwood campus indicates the higher tolerance of their users during both heat
 214 and cold conditions.




Figure 7 Regression model between MTSV and PET for (a) the aggregated data, summer and winter (b) Federation square and Burwood campus.

215
 216 **4.2.2 Neutral PET range (NPETR)**

217 The NPETR is the lowest benchmark reported in OTC studies. However, it allows a quick
 218 understanding of thermal comfort ranges within cities. The value of this benchmark is determined
 219 by solving the fitted LR equation with mean thermal sensation votes of ± 0.5 . NPETR values for the

220 aggregated data in this study ranged from 17.5°C to 23.2°C. NPETR varied from 17°C to 22.9°C
221 during summer and from 20°C to 28.4°C during winter.

222

223 4.2.3 Preferred PET (PPET)

224 Thermal preferences towards having cooler and warmer climatic conditions recorded by
225 respondents were evaluated for considering bins with a width of 0.5°C PET. To calculate the PPET,
226 a probit regression analysis for both warmer and cooler preferences was modelled and the
227 intersection of both corresponded to the preferred temperature. This is the most commonly used
228 method in PPET calculations that were originally recommended by Ballantyne, Hill, and Spencer
229 (1977). Values of 19.2°C and 23.2°C were obtained for the aggregated data and during summer
230 respectively from the two fitted lines as shown in Fig. 8. The non-parametric Chi-square assessing
231 the goodness of fit of the probit models for both cooler and warmer preferences in the aggregated
232 data indicated statistically significant results of ($X^2 = 90.706$, $d(f) = 57$, $p < 0.05$) and ($X^2 = 103.643$,
233 $d(f) = 57$, $p < 0.01$) respectively. The probit models fitted well on both sides. The chi-square during
234 winter indicated non-significant result, which indicates that winter data does not fit in the probit
235 model.




Figure 8 The preferred temperature obtained from the probit model for (a) all data (b) summer data

236

237

238 PPET for both urban places were also calculated using the logistic curve model with the probit
 239 function. Statistical significance of ($X^2 = 60.490$, d (f) = 39, $p < 0.005$) resulted for the different
 240 preferences in Federation square. In Burwood campus both warmer and cooler preferences also
 241 indicated statistical significance of ($X^2 = 110.426$, d (f) = 53, $p < 0.001$) and ($X^2 = 96.322$, d (f) = 53, p
 242 < 0.001) respectively. The preferred PET values obtained in Federation square and Burwood campus
 243 from the intersection of the two fitted probability lines are 19.3°C and 19.2°C which are 0.7 and
 244 1.4°C less than the NPET obtained earlier.




Figure 9 The preferred temperature obtained from the probit model for (a) Federation square (b) Burwood campus

245

246 4.2.4 Thermal acceptability range (TAR)

247 This benchmark is frequently determined in thermal comfort studies for the design of outdoor
 248 environments (Cheung & Jim, 2017). The common method of identifying TAR is the intersection of
 249 the acceptability line of 80 % or 90% with the quadratic polynomial fitting the acceptability
 250 percentages in 1°C or 2°C PET intervals. To calculate the TAR and the PET range for Melbourne, the
 251 best-fitted curve between the percentage of acceptability for in correspondence to PET bins with a
 252 width of 1°C were used (Fig. 10). The minimum acceptable rate for thermal conditions is 80%
 253 (ASHRAE, 2004); however, this percentage (20% unacceptability) showed a large range of
 254 acceptable temperature from 15 to 29.9°C. For more precision, a percentage of 90% acceptability
 255 range is selected for defining TAR, which was calculated to vary from 20 to 24.9°C. The TAR

256 calculated at Federation square ranged from 17.5 to 22.6°C and in Burwood campus from 20.1 to
 257 25.3°C with 90% and 88% acceptability rates respectively.




Figure 10 Distribution of Percentage of unacceptability votes

258
 259 Due to the significance of TAR benchmark, this study also used the approach of Yang, Wong, and
 260 Jusuf (2013) relying on the assumption that the mean thermal sensation votes of ± 0.85 on the
 261 ASHRAE scale correspond to 80% of thermal acceptability (ISO-7730, 2005). When substituting
 262 $MTSV = \pm 0.85$ in Eq. (2), a range of 15.5°C and 25.2°C is obtained. This range is narrower than its
 263 equivalent of 80% acceptability obtained from the quadratic polynomial model. The same pattern
 264 was found when calculating TAR for the different urban places as shown in Fig.11.





Figure 11 TAR using different methods in Federation square and Burwood campus

265
 266 **4.2.5 PET classification for Melbourne**

267 To obtain the classification of thermal perception for Melbourne city, this study used the framework
 268 of Lin and Matzarakis (2008). The PET comfort classification is calculated by increasing and



269 decreasing the interval of each point in the scale by 5°C (the difference between 20 and 25°C
 270 previously calculated TAR). The PET classification results are shown in Fig. 12.

271 **Figure 12** PET classification for Melbourne City, Australia.
 272

273 **5 Discussion**

274 *5.1 Thermal comfort benchmarks*

275 *5.1.1 Neutral PET (NPET)*

276 Regional differences are noticed in the NPET values when comparing the obtained results to other
 277 studies. The NPET value was found to be 20.4°C, which is similar to Athens, Greece (Pantavou et al.,
 278 2013) classified with its hot dry summers. Although the context of this study is having the same
 279 climatic zone as Szeged, Hungary (Kántor et al., 2016), NPET is almost 2°C higher. This difference
 280 can be related to the lower mean temperature winter readings in Hungary when compared to those
 281 in Melbourne. A wide variation of almost 8°C is identified between NPET in this study and its
 282 equivalent in the tropical rainforest climate of Singapore (Yang, Wong, & Zhang, 2013).




Figure 13 Mean air temperature in different OTC studies
 Source:(Climate-Data.org, 2017)

283 It is observed from Fig. 13 and Table 3 that the cities characterised by hot climates are having higher
 284 NPET than those having cold climates. Different NPET values in Guangzhou, China were calculated
 285 in different studies (Liu et al., 2016; Yang, Wong, & Zhang, 2013; Zhao et al., 2016); however, the
 286 different types of their studied urban places could explain this variation.

287 Another variation was detected during different seasons. NPET during summer was generally found
 288 to be higher than winter in the previous studies, with a difference varying from 0.9°C (Elnabawi et
 289 al., 2016) and 11.8°C (da Silveira Hirashima et al., 2016). In this study, NPET during winter was found
 290 to be 4.4°C higher than during summer. This variation was in line with other studies in Melbourne
 291 (Shooshtarian & Ridley, 2017) and Hungary (Kántor et al., 2016) having the same Cfb climatic
 292 classification that had higher values during autumn than summer of 4.63°C and 2.1°C respectively.
 293 Damascus (Yahia & Johansson, 2013) and Sydney (Spagnolo & de-Dear, 2003) also had the same
 294 pattern of higher NPET winter values of 7.6°C and 5.9°C respectively. In addition to the climate
 295 characteristics of the different regions, Li et al. (2016) and Salata et al. (2016) explained this variation
 296 by the psychological human mechanism of Alliesthesia, tending towards favouring high air
 297 temperature during cold and vice-versa.

Reference	Neutral PET				Comments and used analysis
	Summer	Winter	Other	Overall	
Melbourne, This study	20	24.4	-	20.4	Linear Regression(LR) MTSV vs PET bin (0.5°C)
Singapore, Singapore (Yang, Wong, & Zhang, 2013)				28.1	LR MTSV vs PET bin (0.5°C)
Singapore, Singapore (Yang, Wong, & Jusuf, 2013)				28.7	LR MTSV vs OT
Belo Horizonte, Brazil (da Silveira Hirashima et al., 2016)	27.7	15.9	-	-	LR MTSV vs PET bin (1°C)
Damascus, Syria (Yahia & Johansson, 2013)	15.8	23.4	-	-	PA using PET
Cairo, Egypt (Elnabawi et al., 2016)	29.5	24.3	-	-	LR between MTSV and PET)
Cairo, Egypt (Mahmoud, 2011)	27.4	26.5			Average LR MTSV vs PET for 9 zones

Guangzhou, China (Li et al., 2016)	-	15.6	25.6 spring	-	PET, (LR TSV vs PET)
Guangzhou, China (Zhao et al., 2016)	-	-	-	23.9	LR MTSV vs for each 2°C degree SET* interval
Changsha, China (Liu et al., 2016)	17.5	14.9	23.3 autumn	18.6	LR
Changsha, China (Yang, Wong, & Zhang, 2013)	-	-		27.9	LR MTSV vs PET bin (0.5°C)
Sydney, Australia (Spagnolo & de-Dear, 2003)	22.9	28.8		24	Probit intersection of trans. curves at 50% probability PET
Taiwan (Lin & Matzarakis, 2008)				27.2	LR MTSV vs PET bin (1°C)
Szeged, Hungary (Kántor, Égerházi, et al., 2012; Kántor, Unger, et al., 2012)				18.5 (LR)	LR and QR - MTSV vs PET bin (1°C)
Szeged, Hungary (Kántor et al., 2016)	16.4 (LR)		17.7 spring 18.5 autumn	18.53 (LR)	LR and QR - MTSV vs PET bin (1°C) and different interpretations for TSV = 0 in (PA)
Melbourne, Australia (Shooshtarian & Ridley, 2017)	20.47		19.4 spring 25.1 autumn		LR MTSV vs PET bin 2°C
Athens, Greece (Pantavou et al., 2013)				20.3	LR MTSV vs (index) bin (1°C)
Tel Aviv (Cohen et al., 2013)	23.9	22.7			LR MTSV vs (index) bin (1°C)
Rome, Italy (Salata et al., 2016)	26.9	24.9			LR mean TSV vs PET bin (1°C)
Taichung, Taiwan (Lin, 2009)	25.6	23.7			LR MTSV vs PET bin (1°C)

Table 3 Neutral PET values in different OTC studies

298
299

300 5.1.2 Neutral PET range (NPETR)

301 NPETR values for the aggregated data in this study ranged from 17.5°C to 23.2°C. This range is
302 limited when compared to the corresponding range in Hungary (Kántor et al., 2016). Although both
303 cities belong to the same climatic temperate zone, a wider range skewed toward cooler
304 temperature is perceived in Hungary. This difference could also be explained by the lower mean
305 temperature readings in Hungary in comparison to Melbourne city. On the other side, the values in
306 Rome (Salata et al., 2016) were inclined towards higher temperature values, which again could be
307 related to their higher mean temperature during summer as shown in Fig. 13.

308 NPETR varied from 17°C to 22.9°C during summer and from 20°C to 28.4°C during winter. Only the
309 winter range can be compared to both Shanghai (Chen et al., 2015) and Changsha (Liu et al., 2016)

310 that were found to have a skewness towards the lower temperature, which could also be related
 311 to their climatic characteristics. It is noticed that the winter range for Shanghai is wider due the
 312 diversity of climatic conditions during winter that makes residents more tolerant to the different
 313 climates as explained by Chen et al. (2015). These variations show that the different climatic
 314 conditions affect the users' thermal requirements.

City	Neutral PET Range			Comments and used analysis
	Summer	Winter	Overall	
Melbourne, This study	17 - 22.9	20 - 28.4	17.5 - 23.2	LR MTSV vs PET bin (0.5°C) TSV = ±0.5
Shanghai, China (Chen et al., 2015)		15 - 29		LR MTSV vs PET bin (1°C) TSV = ±0.5
Changsha, China (Liu et al., 2016)		15 - 22		LR MTSV vs PET bin (1°C) TSV = ±0.5
Szeged, Hungary (Kántor, Égerházi, et al., 2012; Kántor, Unger, et al., 2012)			7 - 39	LR MTSV vs PET bin (1°C) TSV = ±0.5
Szeged, Hungary (Kántor et al., 2016)			13.5 - 22.2	LR MTSV vs PET bin (1°C) TSV = ±0.5
Rome, Italy (Salata et al., 2016)			21.1 - 29.2	LR MTSV vs PET bin (1°C) TSV = ±0.5

315 **Table 4 Neutral PET range values in different OTC studies**

316

317 5.1.3 Preferred PET (PPET)

318 It is observed from the comparison in Table 5 that the PPET value for the aggregated data is almost
 319 similar to Szeged (Kántor et al., 2016) belonging to the same Cfb climatic zone. Other studies had
 320 very close PPET despite their different climate characteristics including Cairo (Elnabawi et al., 2016)
 321 and Guangzhou (Zhao et al., 2016), which belong to hot arid and humid subtropical climatic zones
 322 respectively. The same pattern is repeated for Singapore (Yang, Wong, & Zhang, 2013) and Sydney
 323 (Spagnolo & de-Dear, 2003) having tropical rainforest and humid subtropical climates respectively.
 324 The value of PET during summer (23.2°C) also resembles those calculated in Sydney (23.4°C),
 325 followed by Taichung (24.5°C), Melbourne (24.6 when using LR), and Rome (24.8°C). The difference
 326 between NPET and PPET for aggregated and summer data are -3.2 and 1.2°C respectively. Yang,
 327 Wong, and Jusuf (2013) explained this variance results from the respondents' preferences to the
 328 word 'cool' than 'warm' that have an undesirable psychological effect.

City	Neutral PET (°C)				Comments and used analysis
	Summer	Winter	Other	Overall	
Melbourne, this study	23.2			19.2	Probability analysis (PA) (1.2° difference from NPET)
Singapore, Singapore (Yang, Wong, & Zhang, 2013)				25.2	PA (2.9° difference)
Singapore, Singapore (Yang, Wong, & Jusuf, 2013)				26.5	PA (2.2° difference)
Belo Horizonte, Brazil (da Silveira Hirashima et al., 2016)	14.9	20.9			PA (12.8° (summer) and -5° (winter) difference)
Cairo, Egypt (Elnabawi et al., 2016)				24	PA (5.5° difference from NPET)
Guangzhou, China (Li et al., 2016)	-	18.8	30 spring	-	Polynomial relation MTSV & PET, (-4.4° (spring) -3.2°(winter) difference)
Guangzhou, China (Zhao et al., 2016)	-	-	-	23.7	PA (0.2° difference)
Changsha, China (Yang, Wong, & Zhang, 2013)	-	-		22.1	PA (5.8° difference)
Sydney, Australia (Spagnolo & de-Dear, 2003)	23.4	30.9		25	PA (-0.5 (summer), -2.1 (winter), -1° (total) difference)
Szeged, Hungary (Kántor et al., 2016)				18.53	PA with different interpretations for 'no change' votes (0.93°, -1.17°, & 1.03° difference)
Melbourne, Australia (Shooshtarian & Rajagopalan, 2017)	15 (PA) 24.6 (LR)		27.5spring, 32.1autumn		LR MTSV and PET and PA (5.4 (summer), -8.3 (spring), -7° (autumn) difference)
Rome, Italy (Salata et al., 2016)	24.8	22.5			PA (2.1° (summer) and 2.4° (winter) difference)
Taichung, Taiwan (Lin, 2009)	24.5	23			PA (1.1° (summer) and 0.7° (winter) difference)

Table 5 Preferred PET values in different OTC studies

329
330

331 5.1.4 Thermal acceptability range (TAR)

332 The values for TAR are compared with other studies as shown in Table 6. When comparing the
333 results obtained from the 80% acceptability rate with peers, it was found that the other study in
334 Melbourne (Shooshtarian & Rajagopalan, 2017) had a close range. However, their study had a wider
335 range that might be explained by the nature of their studied place; a university campus having
336 necessary activities tolerating less quality than other urban places where optional activities occur.
337 Athens' study (Pantavou et al., 2013) also used 80% acceptability rate obtaining a range from 15.4
338 to 26°C, which indicate that their users are less tolerant to heat regardless their higher monthly
339 mean temperature ranging from 10°C to 29°C. The range between 20°C and 24.9°C obtained from
340 the 90% acceptability rate in this study could be also compared with the majority of other OTC

341 studies using the same level. The variation between the different studies indicates that the climate
 342 characteristics are influencing the users' acceptability ranges (Li et al., 2016; Salata et al., 2016). The
 343 most noticeable aspect from the comparison is the narrower range in our study, which confirms
 344 that the users in Melbourne are exposed to limited and moderate climatic conditions. This is clear
 345 from its monthly mean temperature ranging from 9.75 to 20.2°C. A wider range of TAR was found
 346 in Guangzhou (Li et al., 2016) ranging from 18.1 to 31.1°C due to having mean temperature values
 347 ranging from 13 and 29°C. Similar values were found in Cairo (Elnabawi et al., 2016) and Changsha
 348 (Yang, Wong, & Zhang, 2013). Both cities do not belong to the same climatic zones, however, they
 349 have similar monthly mean temperature of 14- 28°C and 16-30°C for Cairo and Changsha
 350 respectively. Yang, Wong, and Jusuf (2013) was the only study using $MSTV = \pm 0.85$ for calculating
 351 TAR. Their calculated TAR was about 4 to 5°C higher than Melbourne, which can also be related to
 352 their climatic characteristics.

City	TAR (°C)		Comments and used analysis
	From	To	
Melbourne, this study	15 20 15.5	29.9 (80%) 24.9 (90%) 25.2 (± 0.85)	90% and 80% acceptability rate, and MTSV = ± 0.85
Singapore, Singapore (Yang, Wong, & Zhang, 2013)	24	30	88% acceptability rate
Singapore, Singapore (Yang, Wong, & Jusuf, 2013)	26.3	31.7	MTSV = ± 0.85
Belo Horizonte, Brazil (da Silveira Hirashima et al., 2016)	19	27	Predicted probability model
Damascus, Syria (Yahia & Johansson, 2013)	22.8 21	28.5 (90%) 31.3 (80%)	90% and 80% acceptability rate
Cairo, Egypt (Elnabawi et al., 2016)	23	32	90% acceptability rate
Shanghai, China (Chen et al., 2015)	13 9	30 autumn 25 winter	90% acceptability rate
Guangzhou, China (Li et al., 2016)	18.1 16.9 27.9	31.1 22.7 winter 32.3 spring ≤ 32.4 summer	90% acceptability rate
Guangzhou, China (Zhao et al., 2016)	28.54 (90%)	31.1 (80%)	90% and 80% acceptability rate

Changsha, China (Yang, Wong, & Zhang, 2013)	24	31	88% acceptability rate
Sun moon lake, Taiwan (Lin & Matzarakis, 2008)	21.6	35.6	88% acceptability rate
Melbourne, Australia (Shooshtarian & Rajagopalan, 2017)	14.2 19.8 (TSV)	33.1 24.1 (TSV)	80% acceptability rate from direct thermal acceptance and from TSV
Athens, Greece (Pantavou et al., 2013)	15.4	26.5	80% acceptability rate
Tel Aviv (Cohen et al., 2013)	19 20	25 winter 26 summer	90% acceptability rate
Taichung, Taiwan (Lin, 2009)	21.3	28.5	90% acceptability rate

Table 6 Thermal Acceptability Range values in different OTC studies

353
354

355 5.1.5 PET classification for Melbourne

356 PET classification for Melbourne city in comparison to other studies is illustrated in Table 7. The
357 table shows that the values of temperature sensation scale for Melbourne are very close to
358 Western/Middle Europe. However, Melbourne residents are slightly less tolerated to cold
359 temperature as the cold votes lied between 5 and 10°C while the same votes for Western/Middle
360 Europe region ranged from 4°C to 8°C. A great difference can also be observed between the scales
361 in Taiwan, which might be related to their mean monthly temperature ranging from 16 to 29°C.
362 Taiwan classification showed lower tolerance to cold and vice versa for warm climatic conditions.
363 The comparison could be explained by the mean monthly temperature for the different regions,
364 however, some limitation could be perceived due to the variety of methods used in identifying the
365 PET classification. The method used in this study is similar to its equivalent in Taiwan (Lin &
366 Matzarakis, 2008). However, Tel Aviv (Cohen et al., 2013), Tianjin (Lai et al., 2014) and Melbourne
367 (Shooshtarian & Rajagopalan, 2017) used discriminant analysis, linear regression and probit analysis
368 respectively. Yang, Wong, and Zhang (2013) used the 88% in identifying the neutral range, which is
369 very close to the 90% used in this study. However, they used the same intervals of 4°C used by Lin
370 and Matzarakis (2008) rather than the difference calculated from TAR.

	PET (°C) range calculated for								
	Melbourne, this study	Western /Middle Europe (Matzarakis et al., 1999)	Tel Aviv (Cohen et al., 2013)	Taiwan (Lin & Matzarakis, 2008)	Tianjin (Lai et al., 2014)	Changsha (Liu et al., 2016)	Changsha (Yang, Wong, & Zhang, 2013)	Singapore (Yang, Wong, & Zhang, 2013)	Melbourne (Shooshtarian & Rajagopalan, 2017)
Very Cold (-4)	5	4	8	14	-16	-8	NA	NA	NA
Cold (-3)	10	8	12	18	-11	-1	NA	NA	9.4
Cool (-2)	15	13	15	22	-6	7	20	20	13.2
Slightly Cool (-1)	20	18	19	26	11	15	24	24	19.4
Neutral (0)	25	23	26	30	24	22	31	30	22.9
Slightly Warm (1)	30	29	28	34	31	30	35	34	29.2
Warm (2)	35	35	34	38	36	38	39	38	45
Hot (3)	40	41	40	42	46	46	43	42	NA
Very Hot (4)									

Table 7 classification in different OTC studies

371
372

373 6 Conclusion

374 Outdoor places have a significant role in the liveability and sustainability within cities. Outdoor
375 thermal comfort benchmarks could support the design of comfortable outdoor places as well as
376 reducing the cooling energy demand for indoor settings. This paper aimed to identify these OTC
377 benchmarks for the Australian Temperate Oceanic climatic zone. Various methods were used in
378 identifying the different benchmarks, which obstruct having reasonable comparisons between the
379 different regions (Cheung & Jim, 2017; Salata et al., 2016). Accordingly, the study reviewed the
380 commonly used methods to obtain the different benchmarks. To analyse objective measurements
381 and subjective assessments, meteorological measurements were monitored during summer and
382 winter simultaneously with 2123 randomly distributed questionnaires covering personal data,
383 thermal perception, preference, and acceptance. NPET were calculated using a linear regression
384 between the mean thermal sensation votes (MTSV) for each temperature interval of PET calculated

385 based on measured micrometeorological data. When substituting $MTSV=0$ in the regression, NPET
386 was found to be 20.4°C . NPET values in Federation square and Burwood campus were of 19.9°C and
387 20.7°C respectively suggesting that the campus' users have higher tolerance towards both heat and
388 cold conditions. This could return to the necessary activities realised in the campus, where less
389 quality of physical characteristics could be acceptable (Gehl, 2011). NPET was calculated to be also
390 higher than its equivalent in summer. These seasonal variations were explained by the psychological
391 human mechanism of Alliesthesia, tending towards favouring high air temperature during cold and
392 vice-versa (Li et al., 2016; Salata et al., 2016). By solving the equation having $MTSV=\pm 0.5$, the
393 calculated NPETR varied from 17.5°C to 23.2°C . PPET is typically obtained from the intersection of
394 the two probit analysis for cooler and warmer preferences recorded by users. PPET values for the
395 aggregated and summer data were calculated to be 19.2°C and 23.2°C respectively. Due to its
396 significance, TAR was obtained using three different methods. The main used method was the
397 intersected acceptability line of 90% with the quadratic polynomial fitting the acceptability
398 percentages in 1°C PET intervals. A thermal acceptability rate ranging from 20 and 24.9°C was
399 attained using this method. Although NPET and PPET were not in the centre of the acceptability
400 range, Cheung and Jim (2017) explained that by the users' physical, psychological, and physiological
401 status influencing their preferences. The PET classifications were found to range from very cold
402 ($\leq 5^{\circ}\text{C}$), cold ($5^{\circ}\text{C}-10^{\circ}\text{C}$), cool ($10^{\circ}\text{C}-15^{\circ}\text{C}$), slightly cool ($15^{\circ}\text{C}-20^{\circ}\text{C}$), neutral ($20^{\circ}\text{C}-25^{\circ}\text{C}$), slightly warm
403 ($25^{\circ}\text{C}-30^{\circ}\text{C}$), warm ($30^{\circ}\text{C}-35^{\circ}\text{C}$), hot ($35^{\circ}\text{C}-40^{\circ}\text{C}$) and very hot ($\geq 40^{\circ}\text{C}$). The influence of climatic
404 conditions, represented by the mean monthly temperature, and the thermal adaptation, were two
405 main reasons for the variations of results in the different OTC studies. Users residing in hot and
406 humid regions showed higher tolerance toward high temperature when compared to those in
407 temperate climatic conditions. Finally, these benchmarks provide a good representation for OTC in

408 the temperate oceanic climatic zones in Australia represented by two studied urban places in
409 Melbourne city. The same method could also be employed internationally to obtain equivalent
410 benchmarks in the different regions.

411
412 *References*

- 413 Aljawabra, F., & Nikolopoulou, M. (2010). Influence of hot arid climate on the use of outdoor urban
414 spaces and thermal comfort: Do cultural and social backgrounds matter? *Intelligent Buildings*
415 *International*, 2(3), 198-217.
- 416 ASHRAE. (2001). ASHRAE Handbook of Fundamentals. Atlanta: American Society of Heating
417 Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers.
- 418 ASHRAE. (2004). Standard 55: Thermal environmental conditions for human occupancy. Atlanta, USA:
419 American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers.
- 420 Ballantyne, E. R., Hill, R. K., & Spencer, J. W. (1977). Probit analysis of thermal sensation assessments.
421 *International Journal of Biometeorology*, 21, pp. 29–43.
- 422 Boland, J., Ridley, B., & Brown, B. (2008). Models of diffuse solar radiation. *Renewable Energy*, 33(4),
423 575-584.
- 424 BOM. (2017). Climate statistics for Australian locations, Bureau of Meteorology, Australia.
425 http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/averages/tables/cw_086071.shtml
- 426 Burberry, P. (1997). *Environment and services*. England, UK: Mitchell's Building Series.
- 427 Chen, L., & Ng, E. (2012). Outdoor thermal comfort and outdoor activities: A review of research in the
428 past decade. *Cities*, 29(2), 118–125. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2011.08.006>
- 429 Chen, L., Wen, Y., Zhang, L., & Xiang, W.-N. (2015). Studies of thermal comfort and space use in an
430 urban park square in cool and cold seasons in Shanghai. *Building and Environment*, 94, 644-653.
431 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2015.10.020>
- 432 Cheng, V., Ng, E., Chan, C., & Givoni, B. (2012). Outdoor thermal comfort study in a sub-tropical climate:
433 a longitudinal study based in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Biometeorology*, 56(1), 43-56.
434 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00484-010-0396-z>
- 435 Cheung, P. K., & Jim, C. (2017). Determination and application of outdoor thermal benchmarks. *Building*
436 *and Environment*, 123, 333-350. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2017.07.008>
- 437 Climate-Data.org. (2017). Climate data for cities worldwide. Retrieved from [https://en.climate-](https://en.climate-data.org/)
438 [data.org/](https://en.climate-data.org/)
- 439 Cochran, W. G. (2007). *Sampling techniques*: John Wiley & Sons.
- 440 Cohen, P., Potchter, O., & Matzarakis, A. (2013). Human thermal perception of Coastal Mediterranean
441 outdoor urban environments. *Applied Geography*, 37(0), 1-10.
442 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2012.11.001>
- 443 da Silveira Hirashima, S. Q., de Assis, E. S., & Nikolopoulou, M. (2016). Daytime thermal comfort in urban
444 spaces: A field study in Brazil. *Building and Environment*, 107, 245-253.
445 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2016.08.006>
- 446 Eliassona, I., Knez, I., Westerberg, U., Thorssona, S., & Lindberga, F. (2007). Climate and behaviour in
447 a Nordic city. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 82(1-2), 72-84.
- 448 Elnabawi, M. H., Hamza, N., & Dudek, S. (2016). Thermal perception of outdoor urban spaces in the hot
449 arid region of Cairo, Egypt. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 22, 136-145.
450 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2016.02.005>
- 451 Fanger, P. O. (1982). *Thermal Comfort, Analysis and Applications in Environmental Engineering*. New
452 York: McGraw-Hill.

453 Gagge, A. P., Fobelets, A. P., & Berglund, L. G. (1986). A standard predictive index of human response
454 to the thermal environment. *ASHRAE Transactions*, 92(2B), 709–731.

455 Gehl, J. (2011). *Life between buildings, using public spaces*. Washington: Island Press.

456 Holst, J., & Mayer, H. (2011). Impacts of street design parameters on human-biometeorological
457 variables. *Meteorologische Zeitschrift*, 20(5), 541-552. doi:DOI: 10.1127/0941-2948/2011/0254

458 Höppe, P. (1999). The physiological equivalent temperature – A universal index for the
459 biometeorological assessment of the thermal environment. *International Journal of*
460 *Biometeorology*, 43 71–75. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s004840050118

461 ISO-7730. (1994). *Moderate thermal environments – determination of the PMV and PPD indices and*
462 *specification of the conditions for thermal comfort*. Retrieved from

463 ISO-7730. (2005). *Ergonomics of the thermal environment – Analytical determination and*
464 *interpretation of thermal comfort using calculation of the PMV and PPD indices and local thermal*
465 *comfort criteria Geneva: International Standard Organization.*

466 ISO. (2002). *International Standard 7726, thermal environment-instruments and method for measuring*
467 *physical quantities*. Geneva International Standard Organization.

468 Johansson, E., Thorsson, S., Emmanuel, R., & Krüger, E. (2014). Instruments and methods in outdoor
469 thermal comfort studies–The need for standardization. *Urban Climate*, 10, 346-366.
470 doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.uclim.2013.12.002

471 Kántor, N., Égerházi, L., & Unger, J. (2012). Subjective estimation of thermal environment in recreational
472 urban spaces—part 1: investigations in Szeged, Hungary. *International Journal of*
473 *Biometeorology*, 56(6), 1075-1088. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00484-012-0523-0

474 Kántor, N., Kovács, A., & Takács, Á. (2016). Seasonal differences in the subjective assessment of outdoor
475 thermal conditions and the impact of analysis techniques on the obtained results. *International*
476 *Journal of Biometeorology*, 60(11), 1615-1635. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00484-016-1151-
477 x

478 Kántor, N., & Unger, J. (2010). Benefits and opportunities of adopting GIS in thermal comfort studies in
479 resting places: An urban park as an example *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 98(1), 36-46.
480 doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2010.07.008

481 Kántor, N., Unger, J., & Gulyás, Á. (2012). Subjective estimations of thermal environment in recreational
482 urban spaces—Part 2: international comparison. *International Journal of Biometeorology*, 56(6),
483 1089-1101. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s00484-012-0564-4

484 Krüger, E., Drach, P., Emmanuel, R., & Corbella, O. (2013). Urban heat island and differences in outdoor
485 comfort levels in Glasgow, UK. *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*, 112(1-2), 127-141.

486 Lai, D., Guo, D., Hou, Y., Lin, C., & Chen, Q. (2014). Studies of outdoor thermal comfort in northern
487 China. *Building and Environment*, 77, 110-118.
488 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2014.03.026

489 Lam, C. K. C., Loughnan, M., & Tapper, N. (2018). Visitors' perception of thermal comfort during extreme
490 heat events at the Royal Botanic Garden Melbourne. *International Journal of Biometeorology*,
491 62(1), 97-112.

492 Lee, H., Holst, J., & Mayer, H. (2013). Modification of human-biometeorologically significant radiant flux
493 densities by shading as local method to mitigate heat stress in summer within urban street
494 canyons. *Advances in Meteorology*, 2013, 13 pages. doi:DOI: 10.1155/2013/312572

495 Lee, H., & Mayer, H. (2016). Validation of the mean radiant temperature simulated by the RayMan
496 software in urban environments. *International Journal of Biometeorology*, 60(11), 1775-1785.
497 doi:DOI: 10.1007/s00484-016-1166-3

498 Lee, H., & Mayer, H. (2018). Maximum extent of human heat stress reduction on building areas due to
499 urban greening. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 32, 154-167. doi:DOI:
500 10.1016/j.ufug.2018.04.010

501 Lee, H., Mayer, H., & Chen, L. (2016). Contribution of trees and grasslands to the mitigation of human
502 heat stress in a residential district of Freiburg, Southwest Germany. *Landscape and Urban*
503 *Planning, 148*, 37-50. doi:DOI: 10.1016/j.landurbplan.2015.12.004

504 Lee, H., Mayer, H., & Schindler, D. (2014). Importance of 3-D radiant flux densities for outdoor human
505 thermal comfort on clear-sky summer days in Freiburg, Southwest Germany. *Meteorologische*
506 *Zeitschrift, 23*(3), 315-330. doi:DOI: 10.1127/0941-2948/2014/0536

507 Leech, J. A., Burnett, R., Nelson, W., & Aaron, S. D. (2000). Outdoor air pollution in epidemiologic
508 studies. *American Journal of Respiration and Critical Care Medicine, 161*(3), A308.

509 Li, K., Zhang, Y., & Zhao, L. (2016). Outdoor thermal comfort and activities in the urban residential
510 community in a humid subtropical area of China. *Energy and Buildings, 133*, 498-511.
511 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.10.013

512 Lin, T.-P., & Matzarakis, A. (2008). Tourism climate and thermal comfort in Sun Moon Lake, Taiwan.
513 *International Journal of Biometeorology, 52*, 281-290. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00484-
514 007-0122-7

515 Lin, T. P. (2009). Thermal perception, adaptation and attendance in a public square in hot and humid
516 regions. *Building and Environment, 44*(10), 2017–2026.
517 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2009.02.004

518 Lin, T. P., de Dear, R., & Hwang, R. L. (2011). Effect of thermal adaptation on seasonal outdoor thermal
519 comfort. *International Journal of Climatology, 31*(2), 302-312.
520 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/joc.2120

521 Liu, W., Zhang, Y., & Deng, Q. (2016). The effects of urban microclimate on outdoor thermal sensation
522 and neutral temperature in hot-summer and cold-winter climate. *Energy and Buildings, 128*, 190-
523 197. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.06.086

524 Mahmoud, A. H. A. (2011). Analysis of the microclimatic and human comfort conditions in an urban
525 park in hot and arid regions. *Building and Environment, 46*(12), 2641-2656.
526 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2011.06.025

527 Makaremi, N., Salleh, E., Jaafar, M. Z., & GhaffarianHoseini, A. (2012). Thermal comfort conditions of
528 shaded outdoor spaces in hot and humid climate of Malaysia. *Building and Environment, 48*, 7–
529 14. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2011.07.024

530 Matzarakis, A., Mayer, H., & Isiomon, M. (1999). Applications of a universal thermal index; physiological
531 equivalent temperature. *International Journal of Biometeorology, 43*, 76–84.
532 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s004840050119

533 Matzarakis, A., Rutz, F., & Mayer, H. (2007). Modelling radiation fluxes in simple and complex
534 environments—application of the RayMan model. *International Journal of Biometeorology, 51*
535 (4), 323–334. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s00484-006-0061-8

536 Mayer, H., Holst, J., Dostal, P., Imbery, F., & Schindler, D. (2008). Human thermal comfort in summer
537 within an urban street canyon in Central Europe. *Meteorologische Zeitschrift, 17*(3), 241-250.
538 doi:DOI: 10.1127/0941-2948/2008/0285

539 Mayer, H., & Höppe, P. (1987). Thermal comfort of man in different urban environments. *Theoretical*
540 *and Applied Climatology, 38*, 43–49.

541 McIntyre, D. A. (1980). *Indoor climate*. London: Applied Science Publishers Ltd.

542 Melbourne-for-the-visitor. (2017). Federation Square - Melbourne's iconic meeting place. Retrieved
543 from <http://www.melbourne-for-the-visitor.com/federation-square.html>

544 Ng, E., & Cheng, V. (2012). Urban human thermal comfort in hot and humid Hong Kong. *Energy and*
545 *Buildings, 55*, 51-65. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2011.09.025

546 Nikolopoulou, M., Baker, N., & Steemers, K. (2001). Thermal comfort in outdoor urban spaces:
547 understanding the human parameter. *Solar Energy, 70*(3), 227-235.
548 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0038-092X(00)00093-1

549 Nikolopoulou, M., & Steemers, K. (2003). Thermal comfort and psychological adaptation as a guide for
550 designing urban spaces. *Energy and Buildings*, 35 (1), 95-101. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-7788(02)00084-1)
551 [7788\(02\)00084-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-7788(02)00084-1)

552 Pantavou, K., Theoharatos, G., Santamouris, M., & Asimakopoulos, D. (2013). Outdoor thermal
553 sensation of pedestrians in a Mediterranean climate and a comparison with UTCI. *Building and*
554 *Environment*, 66, 82-95. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2013.02.014>

555 Rushwright-associates. (2017). Deakin University, Central spine precinct. Retrieved from
556 [http://www.rushwright.com/public-facilities/deakin-central-spine-precinct /](http://www.rushwright.com/public-facilities/deakin-central-spine-precinct/)

557 Salata, F., Golasi, I., de Lieto Vollaro, R., & de Lieto Vollaro, A. (2016). Outdoor thermal comfort in the
558 Mediterranean area. A transversal study in Rome, Italy. *Building and Environment*, 96, 46-61.
559 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2015.11.023>

560 Shooshtarian, S., & Rajagopalan, P. (2017). Study of thermal satisfaction in an Australian educational
561 precinct. *Building and Environment*, 123, 119-132.
562 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2017.07.002>

563 Shooshtarian, S., & Ridley, I. (2016). The effect of individual and social environments on the users
564 thermal perceptions of educational urban precincts. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 26, 119-133.

565 Shooshtarian, S., & Ridley, I. (2017). The effect of physical and psychological environments on the users
566 thermal perceptions of educational urban precincts. *Building and Environment*, 115, 182-198.
567 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2016.12.022>

568 Spagnolo, J. C., & de-Dear, R. J. (2003). A field study of thermal comfort in outdoor and semi-outdoor
569 environments in subtropical Sydney Australia. *Building and Environment*, 38, 721-738.
570 doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0360-1323\(02\)00209-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0360-1323(02)00209-3)

571 Thorsson, S., Honjo, T., Lindberg, F., Eliasson, I., & Lim, E.-M. (2007). Thermal comfort and outdoor
572 activity in Japanese urban public places. *Environment and Behavior*, 39(5), 660-684.
573 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916506294937>

574 Thorsson, S., Lindberg, F., Eliasson, I., & Holmer, B. (2007). Different methods for estimating the mean
575 radiant temperature in an outdoor urban setting. *International Journal of Climatology*(27), 1983-
576 1993.

577 Thorsson, S., Lindqvist, M., & Lindqvist, S. (2004). Thermal bioclimatic conditions and patterns of
578 behaviour in an urban park in Goteborg, Sweden. *International Journal of Biometeorology* 48,
579 149-156. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00484-003-0189-8>

580 Xi, T., Li, Q., Mochida, A., & Meng, Q. (2012). Study on the outdoor thermal environment and thermal
581 comfort around campus clusters in subtropical urban areas. *Building and Environment*, 52, 162-
582 170. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2011.11.006>

583 Yahia, M. W., & Johansson, E. (2013). Evaluating the behaviour of different thermal indices by
584 investigating various outdoor urban environments in the hot dry city of Damascus, Syria.
585 *International Journal of Biometeorology*, 57(4), 615-630. doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00484-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00484-012-0589-8)
586 [012-0589-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00484-012-0589-8)

587 Yang, W., Wong, N. H., & Jusuf, S. K. (2013). Thermal comfort in outdoor urban spaces in Singapore.
588 *Building and Environment*, 59(0), 426-435. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2012.09.008>

589 Yang, W., Wong, N. H., & Zhang, G. (2013). A comparative analysis of human thermal conditions in
590 outdoor urban spaces in the summer season in Singapore and Changsha, China. *International*
591 *Journal of Biometeorology*, 57(6), 895-907. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00484-012-0616-9>

592 Zhao, L., Zhou, X., Li, L., He, S., & Chen, R. (2016). Study on outdoor thermal comfort on a campus in a
593 subtropical urban area in summer. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 22, 164-170.
594 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2016.02.009>

595

596