

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for your observations and for the opportunity to improve our manuscript!

We are very grateful for taking the time to analyze the paper and make very useful, encouraging and thoughtful comments and recommendations.

We have read the evaluation carefully and, based on the review reports, we performed significant revisions of our manuscript, as requested, highlighted with red into the manuscript, respectively:

Main problems:

1. The abstract of this article does not explain the specific research content clearly.
Response: We added a phrase in the abstract to better highlight the variables that were used in order to understand citizens' perspective and thus being able to formulate theoretical and practical implications for public administration. They should have been mentioned in the abstract indeed.
2. In the actual use of the questionnaire survey method, there are often problems such as miscellaneous data, difficult data recovery, insufficient data and low data quality. The article should point out how to screen data to select effective questionnaires.
Response:
We added a paragraph in the Method section to explain the valid questionnaires we kept for the research. A screening question regarding the areas where the respondents live was used and we also checked for incomplete questionnaires.
More references were added here. We also explained the dimension of the survey in accordance with the method we used.
3. The role of the proposed framework in the management of air pollution effect was not well described in the article overview. Here, examples are needed.
Response:
A paragraph was added to better emphasize the role of the framework we proposed in the research and also highlighted examples from Bangladesh, China and Antwerp which were analyzed by other researchers showing the role played by the citizen:

“The novelty of our research consists in our focus on citizens’ perspective regarding air pollution management. We believe that this perspective can help authorities in raising the level of compliance when establishing public policies meant to protect the environment. Even if the proposed perspective is not analyzed by other researchers in its entirety, many studies present the success of environmental policies when authorities take into account citizens. Various countries might require different actions: Mahmood [9] shows that more strict regulations are needed in Bangladesh to make citizens comply; Wang and Wheeler [11] studied the connection between fiscal incentives and the changes in the citizens’ behavior and the effect on air quality in China noticing the direct and positive relationship; Van Brussel and Huyse [16] also studied the role played by citizens in reducing air pollution in Antwerp. All these examples show the important role played by the citizen and the fact that authorities should construct their policies and strategies starting from the population”.
4. L55-62: Whether these variables broadly include the perspective of citizens, and whether there are omissions (such as government punitive measures, etc.).
Response: We added the punitive measures within the explanation provided for the first variable which reflects the passive involvement. The specific explanations for the variables are provided in sections 2.1-2.6.

5. L93-95: What does the authors consider that financial incentives and the support offered to the citizens and companies are having a more powerful impact than punitive measures on the citizens' change in behavior based on? Does the authors' view contradict the previous related research that public managers should adopt more strict regulations to reduce air pollution and raise air quality?

Response: Thank you for your observation. We changed the word *consider* with *assume* because this assumption determined us to formulate hypotheses H1 and H3. Both punitive and incentives are more important but our research revealed that incentives are having a higher impact on citizens than punitive measures. The explanation is in the Results and Discussion section. We did not find comparative studies between them in the literature but we started with this assumption. And probably *consider* was not a good choice to express that. So, thank you for noticing the nuance.

Minor problems:

1. (Figure 2) The circle corresponding to POLIMP is not marked with corresponding numbers.

Response: POLIMP is an independent variable in our model so there is no number in the circle. The figure is provided based on Smart-PLS application.

2. (Table 8) The descriptive statistical analysis results of each item will be appropriately placed on after Table 1.

Response: We moved it after table 2 because the model changed after eliminating some items with the outer loadings below 0.6 in table 2.

3. L128-129: The authors chose to survey on citizens from the most important cities in Romania, but in general, the more important cities are, the better they are at independent monitoring of air quality. Did the authors consider that this might affect the MONAIR part of the survey results?

Response: MONAIR refers to the perception of citizens regarding the need for monitoring air quality. The perception does not take into account the real presence of sensors or independent bodies.

4. L147-149: Is there any literature on studies that show pollution increases costs to health systems?

Response: Yes. The reference was in conclusion but we moved it in the literature review. The reference is: WHO Regional Office for Europe. Economic cost of the health impact of air pollution in Europe: Clean air, health and wealth. WHO Regional Office for Europe: Copenhagen, Denmark, 2015. Available online: https://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/276772/Economic-cost-health-impact-air-pollution-en.pdf (accessed on 16 October 2022)

5. L176-177: What exactly is the solution?

Response: We added the solution there, which is represented by "unmanned aerial vehicles".

6. Table1: What is the difference between MOMAIR 1 and MONAIR 2?

Response: In table 1, MONAIR1 refers to the importance of monitoring to ensure transparency because there are also some public owned sensors but the population might not trust them. So, the question for MONAIR1 puts the focus on the need for transparency and MONAIR2 asks citizens about the need for these monitoring sensors in the first place. For example, I might agree that there should be independent bodies to monitor air quality because I do not trust authorities but maybe the importance I give to these sensors/independent bodies is not so high compared with the importance for fiscal incentives for example. And this connection was intended here. And Hypothesis 2 was not supported in our research.

7. It is suggested to add some references in recent years, at the same time, quote the impact of government measures on pollutants during the COVID-19 epidemic (such as:

<https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos12020205>, doi:10.3389/fenvs.2021.806094), and increase the balance between the government's pollutant control measures and social and economic benefits in the discussion section.

Response: The following references were added in the conclusion section in the paragraph regarding future research directions. In the Discussion we kept only studies regarding the variables we considered and discussed if other studies had similar results or not. Also, references number 6,10,14, 21, 36, 50 and 58 are from 2021-2022 and could be seen in the Discussion section too.

Dong, L.; Chen, B.; Huang, Y.; Song, Z.; Yang, T. Analysis on the Characteristics of Air Pollution in China during the COVID-19 Outbreak. *Atmosphere* 2021, 12, 205. <https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos12020205>

Chen B, Huang Y, Huang J, Dong L, Guan X, Ge J, Hu Z. Using Lidar and Historical Similar Meteorological Fields to Evaluate the Impact of Anthropogenic Control on Dust Weather During COVID-19. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, 2021, 619. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2021.806094>