Review report on the Spatial and Temporal Evolution and Spatial Correlation Pattern of the Integration and Development of the Digital Economy and Sports Industry in China

This manuscript is well written and directed to address current issues regarding digital economy. That being said, I provide the following comments for the authors to consider.

1. On the abstract:
    a. The opening statement of statement of the abstract talks about 30 provinces but failed to state the country where they are. Authors should not assume readers are aware of the country of study (China). Please, kindly include China to remove ambiguity.
    b. The method of analysis should be clearly stated.
    c. Please reduce the policy suggestions to one or two as the abstract is a summary of your work. It should be apt and concise in order not to bored the readers.
2. On the introduction: The introductory section is fine but could be improved. I provide a few points.
    a. Authors should strengthen the motivations of the study and provide more arguments on contribution of the study. For instance, how does this study differs from previous studies?
    b. The contribution of the study is not well communicated. Please separate your contributions from the other points. I mean, start the contributions from a new paragraph.
    c. There should be a paragraph at the end of the introduction on the structure of the work.
3. On literature review
    a. This section is totally missing. Was it intentional?
    b. There is need for authors to review certain studies relating to the subject matter. Without reviewing what are existing, lacunas cannot be identified and contributions will be difficult to advance.
    c. I suggest that authors create a section to review studies at least from 2018 to 2022 dealing with subject area of the study. It is good to recognize the contributions of others just like yours will be cited and reviewed after publication.
4. In the last line of section 2 before Table 1, this statement is found in bold "**see Error! Reference source not found.**" I do not think it is proper to state something like this. If you cannot find the reference, it is better to remain silent than putting this kind of confusion. Please, delete it. Please do the same to other areas where similar statement appears.
5. The discussion of results should be linked to recent studies.
6. Conclusion can be improved.
7. The policy recommendations are weak in their present form. They can strengthen it by relating the findings to the recommends.

8. Limitation and future research opportunity should be identified.
9. A lot must be done to improve the writing standard of the manuscript in terms of language structure (for instance, authors state in the introductory section last paragraph and I quote “the purpose of this study ***was*** to……”. In actual fact, purpose of a study should come in present form. Besides, the paragraphs contained too many lines. A standard paragraph should stand between 10 and 15 lines for clarity and avoidance of boredom for readers. Also, long sentences are many in the study.

Overall, the paper is full of potentials that can be evident if the comments above are addressed.