

Author's response
Manuscript Number: XXX
Title: XXX

June 7, 2022

Contents

1	Response to Editor	1
2	Response to Reviewer #2	2
3	Response to Reviewer #3	5
4	Tracked Text Changes	6

1 Response to Editor

Dear Professor XXX,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit a revised draft. I list below in inline format my brief responses to reviewers' comments and attach at the end tracked changes that show precisely the additions and deletions.

Best,
Author

most of it is about flow, tone down, and writing in a more standard/mainstream way--i tried to do a bunch especially following their advice; but i think rubia is better at this kind of revision than me! where my writing typically and inherently suffers from lack of flow, grandiosity, and oddness :))

make sure "clear and well tied together paragraphs"

also note that vast majority of the comments are about intro/lit; tiny bit on discussion; and virtually none on empirical part: method/data/results

im thinking that rev2 may be amin or thrift--comments just like amin and thrift are more conceptual than empirical; both top top scholars

in addition to flow, cut repetition

In general we cut a bit to streamline, and also avoid repetition; we realize that this is an important editorial step as *Cities* may be less polemical than some other journals.

2 Response to Reviewer #2

Thank you for the opportunity to review this original and interesting article on the relationship between urbanicity and misanthropy. As a reviewer in a later round of reviews, I will try to provide specific comments that can push the author(s) forward in the direction the revisions have taken.

thank you for acknowledging a later round of reviews and the direction taken!

First, I still find that the organization and content of the Introduction could be improved. Right now it is organized around quotes and a prior study rather than a more general problem statement and motivation, which should then become briefly grounded in the literature and a definition of the concepts and their origins (including misanthropy and urbanicity - this would mean to move/merge/cut the section with definitions into the Introduction), before pointing out to key gaps and possible research avenues. From there, the authors should articulate their research questions, methods, and core finding, before briefly laying out the organization of the paper. In sum, I would recommend that the authors "just" have an introduction organized around 5-6 clear and well tied together paragraphs. And, as said, I would thus bring much of the mini section on Definitions into the Introduction.

We reorganized. We now do start with "general problem statement and motivation", "briefly grounded in the literature" and per "definition of the concepts and their origins (including misanthropy and urbanicity)" – we did move misanthropy origin and definition up; but we skip on 'urbanicity' definition as readers of Cities journal are well familiar with the concept.

Second, why are the sections called "Theory: Urbanism-Misanthropy Pathways" and the one called "Literature: Urbanism and Distrust/Dislike of Humankind (Misanthropy) separate from one another, and then also separate from and followed by two sub-sections on Gaps and Bias in the Literature and Advantages of City Life? This organization makes the theoretical groundings of the paper very unwoven together. My recommendation would be to have a main Literature section that starts with a subsection on 1) How urbanicity and positive social sentiments are associated (that urban bias you describe later), 2) How urbanicity, in contrast, has been shown to contribute to misanthropy - the many ways in which it does (how) and the drivers (why) of misanthropy in cities. In that Literature section the beginning of it could just start with a more expanded version of what is misanthropy (a reduced version of page 5 and 7) before delving in the HOW and WHY subsections. And then 3) the literature section would finish with a few paragraphs on gaps and the study contribution - just a few short paragraphs at the end before the Methods section. All the gaps should be clearly woven together at the end

DONE:

"main Literature section"

"1) How urbanicity and positive social sentiments are associated (that urban bias you describe later),"

"2) How urbanicity, in contrast, has been shown to contribute to misanthropy - the many ways in which it does (how) and the drivers (why) of misanthropy in cities. In that Literature section the beginning of it could just start with a more expanded version of what is misanthropy (a reduced version of page 5 and 7) before delving in the HOW and WHY subsections."

"And then 3) the literature section would finish with a few paragraphs on gaps and the study contribution - just a few short paragraphs at the end before the Methods section. All the gaps should be clearly woven together at the end"

Third, I will add some general recommendations: a) You could bring in some of the literature that shows how cities (and urban neighborhoods) also contribute to a greater sense of community, and thus possibly to trust into the first subsection of the Lit Review (the one I recommend as reorganization). See these two studies for example: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/>

DONE

b) Many of the statements throughout the literature sections are quite strong, generalized, and not nuanced, I would ensure to add a bit more nuance and disclaimer throughout. For example "Humans have ingroup preference or homophily, and accordingly, lack preference for or dislike heterogeneity" could become "In general, humans have been shown to XXX". Or "several studies point to XXX"

DONE **TODO still probably mellow down more**

c) In the discussion about overcrowding/density in cities, I would recommend to add a bit more to the discussion in terms of the drivers underpinning overcrowding/small apartment living etc, including uneven urban development, gentrification and displacement, as well as inequality in large globalizing cities.

DONE

d) Many of your points are "dropped" in the middle or in paragraphs. Please review your narrative to make the literature section flow better, and have better transitions and connections. There are some bold statements that, again, require context and nuance - or might simply be omitted. For example, the text "it is important to remember that the modern city and urbanization have started with the industrial revolution. The main rationale for urbanism has been capitalistic and economic".

DONE moved that part to appendix and added refs

TODO perhaps need to still find more like that example
TODO flow

e) Similarly, Some paragraphs are too short and just seem "dropped in", including those about Pile and Nietzsche, without being logically interwoven in the analysis. The paragraph/reference about Wilson's work is also oddly written. You don't need to explain how many times it has been cited.

DONE moved pile and nietzsche to appendix

DONE the paragraph about wilson where we talk about citation counts moved to appendix

f) Some statements are also a bit too grandiose such as "Such gap in the literature is extraordinarily rare". Or even "there appears to be a pro-urban bias" - can one really talk about a bias? Maybe it would be more nuanced to simply articulate that there is a discussion and debate and the contribution of cities towards social bonds/trust vs. misanthropy - as I suggested above in regard to the organization of the paper.

DONE dropped "Such gap in the literature is extraordinarily rare", toned down on bias; and toned down elsewhere

TODO maybe still mellow down

g) Both in the literature sections and in Results, some points are repeated - for example about misanthropy and what drives misanthropy in the literature or results about larger vs. smaller urban areas and the outcome variables

TODO careful about repetition; if necessary: motivate here

Not sure about this one—we do have some repetition from literature in controls section; but not in results section; in controls section some repetition seems necessary as we motivate out controls

h) In the policy and planning implication sections, you could also add the increased problem of isolation and loniless that planners have to grapple with, which was both exacerbated yet also somewhat addressed by the rise of social support networks during covid.

DONE

3 Response to Reviewer #3

Interesting paper with thorough analysis and discussion of annual survey data since the 70s.

thanks!

1. Apparently this study was already presented in the ISQOLS Virtual conference in August 2021, see abstract 189 on p. 89: https://rdmobile-palermo-production.s3.amazonaws.com/36ae4456-2093-4c98-a287-d5ad7ab50291/event-14231/271615874-Book-of-Abstracts_ISQOLS2021.pdf Please clarify if a paper was or will be published from the conference presentation. In either case, please clarify what is the difference with the present manuscript.

yes! that's us! Not sure what you mean by "if a paper was or will be published from the conference presentation" We presented this paper at a conference; and submitted to this (Cities) journal for a publication. The paper wasn't published anywhere. Neither it will be "published from the conference presentation"—if you mean some conference-type of publication such as proceedings etc. The paper is only under consideration for publication at this (Cities) journal.

The difference between ISQOLS presentation and present manuscript is that at ISQOLS it was an earlier version; and it was a presentation, not a publication.

2. The structure of the paper was not clear. Please add a title for the first section starting on p. 2. Based on the way the text is currently structured I would suggest naming the first main section as Introduction (starting from p. 2) and having "Methods" (p. 8) as section 2. This would mean that the present headings from p.2 to p.8 would become sub-headings of the main heading 1. Introduction.

DONE first section now is titled 'Introduction;' we stucked with original 'Method,' not 'Methods,' for empirical section

DONE per subheadings: yes, we almost proceeded like that, but they are not subheadings of 'Introduction' but of 'Literature'—as recommended by the other reviewer. We strive to compromise to follow advice from all reviewers.

3. The paragraph starting "We conduct empirical quantitative analyses over the years 1972-2016 to test the urban misanthropy thesis. The paper is structured as follows:" on p.2 and ending "misanthropy has been growing there most steeply" on p. 3 already reveals your main statements and conclusions. Those cannot be presented before the analysis. Please move those statements to the Results or Conclusions sections if the data supports them. Please introduce only the article structure on p. 2-3.

DONE

4. The section before Methods (p. 2 to p. 8) needs restructuring; the order of the sub-sections is not logical. In general, an Introduction is easier to follow if you start from general largely known things before going into details. You claim that most of the existing literature is pro-urban; it would be logical to start your literature review with that literature explaining the main benefits and disadvantages of urban life based on the literature. You could then continue by identifying gaps in literature related to negative aspects of urban life and continue with misanthropy related literature review.

DONE (note: the other reviewer also recommended to start with benefits; now we do)

5. I would recommend avoiding the term "pro-urban bias" in the introduction but instead report what the existing literature reports on the advantages and disadvantages of urban life and what are the main gaps.

DONE: dropped the term as much as possible, and where it really needed to be said, we replaced stronger 'bias' with weaker 'proclivity'

4 Tracked Text Changes

(see next page)