

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_127848
Title of the Manuscript:	Research on Performance Measurement and Optimization of Cross-Regional Air Pollution Cooperative Management System
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This is a key study contributing to environmental science, public policy development, and regional planning community. It develops and offers some empirical insights for two regions in China from 2016 to 2022. Based on this, the spatial economics will be integrated with the policy recommendations to provide comprehensive approaches toward the optimization of cross-regional air pollution management with significant implications for sustainable environmental governance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	In my opinion, the title is bit vague and too general. It would have been better to include both dependent and independent variables, together with the region under study, for clarity and focus. <i>"The impact of Collaborative Governance over Cross Functional Air Pollution; Evidence from China."</i>	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is neutral, and it reflects both the main research question and the key findings of the study. However, I believe the presentation of the findings should be more concise and connect the insights from previously published research to this study. That would confirm the validity of this research too.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	This research is scientific in approach since the conclusion was derived through a comprehensive qualitative framework. Interpretations were made logically and presented as a coherent flow. However, the integration of a conceptual framework, operationalization table and a structured methodology could strengthen the relationship of the initial audience focus with the validation through previous literature. I also want to appreciate the hard work invested in the analysis, which substantially adds strength to this study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are well-curated, focusing on recent research articles. Of particular note, the emerging IFRS Sustainability Standards provide a particularly prized opportunity for inclusion. Referencing these standards could enhance the study by aligning cross-functional air pollution assessment with internationally recognized benchmarks, adding substantial depth and relevance.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the language is in standard, and it's properly structured to communicate the research ideas to the intended audience.	
Optional/General comments	There are some formatting issues in the research that need attention. Notably, incorporating a table of abbreviations and interpretations would enhance clarity. Additionally, including relevant appendices and adopting a more structured methodology would strengthen the study's validity and overall presentation.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Warnakulasooriya Dinuk Koumika Thamel
Department, University & Country	University of Peradeniya, Sri Lanka