Reviews of ECONJOURNAL-D-23-00051R2

Analysis of Multi-Factor Dynamic Coupling and Analysis of Management Strategy Options for Urbanization in China: Evidence from the Yangtze River Economic Belt

Round 1

Reviewer 1

IComments to the Author:

- In the manuscript, researchers applied the CD model to analyze the coordination between the urbanization development, economic development and environmental protection of provinces in the YREB.
- The overall coordination analysis results at all levels show the basic characteristics of downstream> midstream> upstream. The economically developed eastern coastal areas still have advantages in coordination compared with the inland areas, which also proves the regional differences in China's development effectiveness from another level.

The study was found to be good. However, there are some points that the authors should consider making it suitable for publication. The comments are as follows:

- Keywords, such as government strategy, should be sourced from the paper and checked.
- The abstract should include a mention of the analysis approach to be used.
- The acronym "YREB" should be explained specifically upon its first mention.
- In the last paragraph of the introduction, the manuscript's structure should be presented.
- Please check the clarity of the phrase 'fairly high " in the sentence of "What is interesting is that, although there is a fairly high coordination level between UD and ED". The entire manuscript needs to be examined.
- Please also check the clarity of the sentence of 'Our research on urbanization and environmental protection as a whole proves that the coupling degree between urbanization and environmental protection has gradually improved'.
- Professional native English editing is required for the paper.
- The statement of "hierarchical analysis (AHP)" needs to be corrected to Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP).
- The characteristics of the decision makers providing data for AHP should be explicitly stated.
- A comma should be used between "VjXj".
- Using the semicolon punctuation (';') is not recommended in the context. For instance, we divide the coupling degree into four levels: when the CD value is lower than 0.3, the result is Severe Imbalance(SI);...
- Please provide detailed explanations for all variables, their corresponding symbols, data, and source of data. Consistency in variable symbols is required

to be maintained consistently across the entire paper.
- The references should be cited in chronological order to maintain a proper sequence. For instance, Li et al., 2009; Du et al., 2006...
- Literature review is not the inventory of the studies you reviewed. The literature review requires further extensive analysis to effectively synthesize existing research and identify any research gaps that can make a valuable contribution to the coupling degree (CD) model.
- The presentation of the tables makes it difficult for readers to follow the data.They should be appropriately aligned.
- The message about the results of this study has not been clearly explained. The manuscript is not written in a clear and concise manner. The entire manuscript appears to be disorganized and unreadable.
- Only some important and significant conclusions could be revealed in this section. For instance, adding the definite conclusion sentence.
- The sentence of "Provides inspiration" is incomplete in conclusion section.

Reviewer 2

I have reviewed the manuscript titled "Analysis of Multi-Factor Dynamic Coupling and Analysis of Management Strategy Options for Urbanization in China: Evidence from the Yangtze River Economic Belt". The paper presents an interesting study, providing some valuable insights on urbanization, economic development, and environmental protection in China. However, there are several areas that require major revisions to meet the standards of the journal.

Major Comments:

Precision in Statements: The manuscript states, "the development strategies of local governments have shown positive intervention in the environment (Guizhou), part intervention (Jiangsu, Anhui, Hubei, Yunnan), a few interventions (Sichuan, Hunan, Shanghai, Zhejiang) and little intervention (Chongqing) four levels". This is a vague assertion and needs further elaboration. It is necessary to provide a clear and objective basis for categorizing these provinces into the respective intervention levels.

Language Quality: The manuscript appears to be written by a non-native English speaker and needs significant language editing. There are numerous instances of awkward phrasing and errors in grammatical structure, which hinder clear communication of the research and findings.

Incomplete Introduction: The introduction section lacks sufficient context and does not provide a clear aim or research question for the study. The authors should include key literature and outline the gaps that the current research is

intended to address, along with clearly stating the study's objectives.

Ambiguous Notation: The terms 'M- EP- UD- ED, L- EP- ED- UD' are used without proper explanation, which may confuse readers. The authors need to clarify what these abbreviations stand for and their relevance to the study.

Inconsistencies in Findings: The statement, 'The study found that Nanchang's population urbanization lags behind other provincial capitals, which shows the possible results of our analysis of population loss.' needs further clarification. The correlation between lagging urbanization and population loss should be supported with appropriate data or references.

Caption Length: Several captions for tables and figures are too lengthy and complex. Captions should be concise, enabling readers to quickly grasp the content without referring back to the main text. The authors should review and revise these captions.

Reference Check: There appears to be some reusing of references, e.g., "Wang, S., Ma, H., & Zhao, Y. (2014)". It is imperative that the authors check all the references for accuracy and appropriateness, ensuring they are not reused erroneously.
Also, authors are suggested to use the following articles:
https://doi.org/10.56578/josa010104
https://doi.org/10.22105/jarie.2021.309116.1390

Round 2

Reviewer 1

After the first revision, it was realized that there were some missing sections in the study. It is recommended that the authors clarify some relevant points in order to be suitable for publication. The comments are as follows:
- The methods/techniques used in the analysis should be mentioned in the abstract.
- In the abstract, it should be written what the abbreviation CD stands for.
- The structure of the manuscript (including sections information) should be described in the last paragraph of the introduction briefly.
- The characteristics of the decision makers providing data for subjective method AHP should be explicitly stated.
- The area of study/specialties of 4 authors and 5 experts should be explained.
- In the manuscript, some abbreviations need to be corrected. For instance, H in H-UD-ED should be HC (HC-UD-ED) if it refers to high coordination. The entire manuscript including paragraphs and tables needs to be examined based on the abbreviations of H, M, S if they refer to coordination.

Reviewer 2

I have reviewed the revised version of your manuscript of this manuscript and would like to provide feedback for the second round of review. Firstly, I appreciate your efforts in addressing the previous comments and improving the manuscript. However, my primary concern remains the literature review, where I had suggested including the following sources to provide a broader perspective:
https://doi.org/10.22105/jarie.2021.309116.1390
https://doi.org/10.56578/jcgirm090202
https://doi.org/10.22105/riej.2023.391773.1374
These references will significantly enhance the depth of your literature review. Furthermore, while the organization of the manuscript has improved, there are still areas that lack clarity, especially in the methodology and results sections. Please ensure a logical flow of ideas. Additionally, there are lingering minor language and grammar issues throughout the manuscript; thorough proofreading is needed.

Round 3

Reviewer 1

The authors have revised their work according to previous comments, and now it can be considered for publication.

Reviewer 2

This version is according to the suggestion.