

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_110448
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of Digital Economy on Carbon Emissions Intensity: Theory and Empirical Evidence from China
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The manuscript explores a crucial intersection between China's digital economy and carbon emissions intensity, providing valuable insights into the sustainability implications of digital development. It contributes significantly to the scientific community's understanding of the complex relationship between economic growth and environmental impact.2. The title is generally suitable, but it could be enhanced for precision. Consider a slight modification such as "Examining the Impact of China's Digital Economy on Carbon Emissions Intensity: Mechanisms, Regional Variations, and Policy Implications" for a more explicit representation of the manuscript's scope.3. The abstract is comprehensive, but it could benefit from a concise preview of primary findings. Including a sentence summarizing key results could provide readers with a quick overview.4. The structure is generally appropriate, but consider incorporating subheadings within the empirical results section to improve organization and readability. Clearly delineate the subsections related to mechanisms and regional heterogeneity.5. The manuscript appears scientifically sound, but a few areas need clarification. Please elaborate on the methodology, specifically the panel data approach, to ensure readers understand the robustness of the chosen analytical framework.6. The references are generally sufficient, but it might be beneficial to include a few more recent sources, especially those addressing the evolving landscape of digital economy and sustainability. Suggested additions could include recent studies or reports on the environmental impact of digital industries. <p>The manuscript explores China's digital economy's impact on carbon emissions intensity, holding significance for the scientific community. While the title aligns with the content, the abstract could offer a more comprehensive overview. The structure is appropriate, but improvements in clarity, particularly in methodology and results, would enhance scientific correctness. References are sufficient, but recent studies could strengthen the literature review. Suggestions include simplifying language, incorporating visual aids, emphasizing policy implications, streamlining the mechanism analysis, clarifying the endogeneity approach, and expanding on study limitations. Additionally, engaging introduction, defining acronyms, and thorough proofreading would enhance overall quality.</p>	We thanks for your comments.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript is well-written and effectively conveys its scientific content.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript provides valuable insights into the relationship between the digital economy and carbon emissions intensity in China. The empirical results are robust, and the paper is well-structured. The abstract is comprehensive, providing a clear overview of the study. The title accurately reflects the content. The language is suitable for scholarly communication. However, to enhance clarity, consider providing specific examples for complex concepts, especially in the "Robustness and Endogeneity Discussion" section. Additionally, while the manuscript discusses the impact on carbon emissions intensity, further exploration of potential policy implications and practical recommendations could strengthen the conclusion. Overall, it's a well-executed study with the potential for significant contributions to the scientific community.	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	