

Author's response

April 2, 2022

Contents

1	Response to Editor	2
---	--------------------	---

1 Response to Editor

Dear Editor,

Thank you for the comments—they have helped us make the paper better! We have revised the manuscript thoroughly and addressed each of the comments as follows:

1 Please format your paper, including reference cite style in the text, no page footnote, etc. You can refer to the papers which have already been published in Cities.

We formatted the paper and adjusted references in text by adding a comma after the author and before the year; we also dropped boxes around citations in text following Cities guidelines, and we dropped the footnotes.

2 Theoretical contribution: This paper is much descriptive. The theoretical thinking in the paper should be strengthened. Which theoretical or academic arguments are you aiming to examine or discuss for urban studies or planning discipline?

What new theories or theoretical knowledge this paper can add in the existing international literature?

At the end of the introduction, we have laid out paper's structure and plan. We've also edited the section titles to better orient the reader. For instance, the literature review now have 3 sections: we start with a dedicated basic theory section, followed by an elaboration of the theory and extension with other relevant literature; and finally, the literature concludes with a section documenting the gap and bias in the literature (the latter as a subsection)

And we'd like to highlight that there is nothing in the literature specifically on the nexus between misanthropy and urbanicity, hence we draw on multiple related theories (e.g., psychology, sociology, neuro)—and provide a contribution by bringing that all together. It might have appeared broad and unfocused because that's the nature of this area of study.

It might have appeared that we were not thorough because we did not cite studies on misanthropy and urbanism. We revised the paper to clearly explain that we don't cite the literature, because it is nonexistent. Strikingly, there is only one study from the 1980s examining misanthropy in urban areas, and that one study was cited only by 4 other studies, none of which focuses on urbanism and misanthropy—hence, our paper fills in an extraordinarily rare gap in the literature!

Thus, we provide a new theory, the misanthropolis theory, based on our empirical data showing that misanthropic levels are highest in the largest places like metropolitan areas. That's the theory here, its new, and we've created it based on this study. There has been no previous research in domestic or international literature showing this nexus, and that alone is a significant contribution to the literature of urban studies.

All these questions must be clearly responded in Introduction, Analysis and Discussion Section.

We now address these questions in introduction section and further elaborate it in the discussion.

In the results section, we reiterate the hypothesis that we are testing, and having reported the results, we state the strength and level of support that the hypothesis received empirically.

3 A thorough and criticism-featured Literature Review section is needed. The existing literature review is insufficient. The novelty/originality should be clearly justified that the manuscript contains sufficient contributions to the new body of knowledge from the international perspective.

We have managed to somewhat extend the literature coverage. And now we explicitly point out the challenge, but also the opportunity in this line of research: There is simply only a handful of writings focusing specifically on misanthropy, which requires to cover a broad spectrum of related literature—we bring together psy,soc, neurological, and some philosophy/humanities. together. This makes the literature

review broad and less streamlined and focused, as it is usually the case. At the same time, it is an opportunity—our topic is truly novel. And we better highlight the novelty of our research and how it contributes to the bodies of literature.

4 The research methods used in the paper should be clearly described, including research design, representative of cases, data sources and collection, analysis process and results presentation. In particular, the analyses should support your debates clearly.

We now cover all of them. We have a dedicated Research Design and Model section, and we clearly state that the GSS is a “nationally representative survey”, we provide the url to the GSS dataset, and describe the data collection process.

In addition, we now briefly summarize the survey content and coverage, and its advantages.

We have added throughout more logic and transition, and glued the arguments better and we have also extended the data description.

You have good data.

Yes, thank you; we now highlight this fact better—we briefly discuss the advantages of the GSS dataset, and we point out the novelty of our topic and how it support our thesis clearly.

But analyses are weak and in-dept analyses of the findings are missed. As a result, your paper reads more like a news report or technical report.

We moved the tables earlier in that section so that the discussion follows the tables more closely and we have elaborated, and explained the rationale and finding better. We have also completely rewritten parts of results section focusing on the careful interpretation of the results.

5 A thorough Discussion Section is needed. How did you combine your findings into the existing theoretical arguments in the field? How did your research fill the existing research gaps in the field? Do you have have any suggestion for future research agenda? Please answer this questions in the Discussion Section

DONE! We added a much thorough discussion connecting our findings to our urban misanthropy theory. Again, there isn't any theoretical arguments in the field due to the lack of research on this topic, and future research will be essential in making these connections. We also discuss future research agenda and possibilities based on our important contribution.

6 Cities is an urban planning and policy journal. Clear urban policy or planning concerns should be addressed in this paper. Firstly, policy issues should be clearly introduced in introduction section. Secondly, policy arguments or debates should be presented in analysis and discussion section. Thirdly, Takeaway for Practice is also encouraged to be included in this paper. It should be clear enough to present your policy recommendations for both local and international practice.

We have completely re-written and extended the “take away for practice section” and included many policy recommendations—we made sure to mainstream this section better towards planners and practitioners locally and internationally. We also refer to it and summarize it briefly in the introduction. The analysis section now is focused on the results, and we've postponed the discussion of the results to the discussion section as recommended.

Thank you very much for your thoughtful comments. They have helped us yield a much stronger manuscript, which we hope will provide an important contribution to the literature.