

Author's response

March 14, 2022

Contents

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

1 Response to Editor

Thank you for the comments—they have helped us to make the paper better!

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 adjusted references in text by adding a comma after the author and before the year; also dropped boxes around citations in text

we dropped 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 introduction we have laid out paper's structure and plan, and we have now more descriptive section titles that should orient the reader better

for instance for the literature we now have 3 sections: we start with a dedicated basic theory section, followed by elaboration of it and extension with other relevant literatures; and finally literature concludes with section documenting the gap and bias in the literature (the latter as a subsection)

And we'd like to highlight that there is nothing specifically on misanthropy hence we draw on multiple related theories psy, soc, neur, etc—contribution to bring all that together! but challenge that it appears broad and unfocused by its nature of this area of study

yes thanks good point, it appears as we were not thorough because we did not cite on misanthropy and urbanism—now we explain better—we don't because strikingly there is only one study from 80s, and that only one study was cited only by 4 others, none of which focus on urbanism and misanthropy—hence our paper fills in an extraordinarily rare gap in the literature

misanthropology theory! that's the theory here, it's new, we have created it
again do say that no research here

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

it is now briefly referenced in introduction section; it is elaborated in discussion

In the results section we repeat the hypothesis that we are testing and having reported the results, we state the strength/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 literature review broad and less streamlined and focused as it is usually the case. At the same time it is opportunity—our topic is truly novel. and we highlight novelty and bodies of lit better

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, we do say that GSS is “nationally representative survey”, we give url to GSS, and describe data collection process

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

We have added thought logic and transition, and glue better—we end and begin sections with signposts to orient the reader and we lay out the plan and structure at the end of introduction

TODO/MAYBE DO CUT unnecessary stuff to SOM

We have extended data description.

TODO!!!!: In particular, the analyses should support your debates clearly. like that later argument to glue better together

You have good data.

ok, thank you; we now highlight it better—we briefly discuss advantages of the GSS, and we point to the novelty of our topic

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

we moved tables earlier in that section so that discussion follows more closely to the tables

we have elaborated, and explained the rationale and finding better

we have completely rewritten parts of results section focusing on 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 any suggestion for future research agenda? Please answer these questions in the Discussion Section

DONE already did a bunch but maybe TODO more ya glue better findings to theory together

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.

there was takeaway for practice section already—now we make sure we direct it better towards planners and practitioners.

We also refer to it and summarize briefly in introduction.

Analysis section is focused on results, we postpone discussion to discussion section.