Open Review

( ) I would not like to sign my review report

(x) I would like to sign my review report

English language and style

( ) English very difficult to understand/incomprehensible

( ) Extensive editing of English language and style required

( ) Moderate English changes required

( ) English language and style are fine/minor spell check required

(x) I don't feel qualified to judge about the English language and style

	Yes	Can be improved	Must be improved	Not applicable
Is the content succinctly described and contextualized with respect to previous and present theoretical background and empirical research (if applicable) on the topic?	( )	( )	(x)	( )
Are all the cited references relevant to the research?	(x)	( )	( )	( )
Are the research design, questions, hypotheses and methods clearly stated?	( )	(x)	( )	( )
Are the arguments and discussion of findings coherent, balanced and compelling?	( )	( )	(x)	( )
For empirical research, are the results clearly presented?	(x)	( )	( )	( )
Is the article adequately referenced?	( )	(x)	( )	( )
Are the conclusions thoroughly supported by the results presented in the article or referenced in secondary literature?	( )	( )	(x)	( )

Response: Thank you very much for your comment**.** I am not the native English person so I used the English Editing from MDPI's services after the reviews of the paper. I hope that you will accept the paper for the publication. You can see the certificate as follows:

We certify that the following article

Factors Affecting Environmental Pollution for Sustainability Development Goals—Evidence from the Asia Countries

Vu Ngoc Xuan

has undergone English language editing by MDPI. The text has been checked for correct use of grammar and common technical terms, and edited to a level suitable for reporting research in a scholarly journal.
MDPI uses experienced, native English speaking editors. Full details of the editing service can be found at
▸ https://www.mdpi.com/authors/english.

MDPI Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute
Basel, Switzerland
December 2022

AUTHORservices

Comments and Suggestions for Authors

Dear Authors,

The article raises important issues of sustainable development and environmental pollution factors.

1. Abstract should be corrected linguistically.

Response to points 1: thank you very much for your comments. I already use the MDPI English service for the better abstract. You can see in the revised paper.

2. Introduction (This part must to be improved.)

The introduction is too short. It lacks a discussion and, above all, a strong presentation of the motivation to undertake research and an indication of the research gap that you are trying to fill. The article should also contain the aim of the work and a short description of the methods used. The introduction should end with the work structure (what did you do).

Response to points 2: thank you very much for your comments. I already added the research gap in the introduction. I also add the short description of the methods used, the aim of the work… Thank again to your useful advices.

3. Literature review (This part must to be improved.)

The literature review as it stands is simply a collection of studies that have been undertaken in the past by researchers, and that is a good thing. However, there is no discussion with the cited studies. I miss the authors' opinions on the factors influencing environmental pollution and the idea of sustainable development. I am somewhat lacking in faith that the article will add something to the existing literature, which is a pity, because I believe that the article has potential and can help to better understand the factors of environmental pollution in the region of Asian countries.

Response to points 3: thank you very much for your comments. I already add some discussions in the literature reviews. I also explain the research gap in this section. Why I studied the paper?

4. Data and methodology (This part can to be improved.)

Data and Methodology explained in a clear, simple way. The study was based on aggregated data available in public comparative studies. Maybe only short time series, but sufficient for this type of research. Methodology properly described. Personally, I think the hypotheses need to be changed so that they can be clearly/simply verified. In this form, the pollutants will always have an impact (positive or negative). However, this is not a necessary change, as the table below the hypotheses shows the direction of the impact.

Response to points 4: thank you very much for your comments. I changed the hypothesis that the population can be negative or positive to the CO2 emissions. Because we cannot collect the data in 2021 and 2022 in the 15 Asia countries, so that the paper have the limitations. I also added the data and method descriptions.

5. Results (This part may remain unchanged.)

Results clearly defined and interpreted. All the analyzed factors contribute to environmental pollution, which is a rather average result. Most of the assumed impact had the expected sign. It is surprising, however, that although only the hypothesis concerning the impact of population on environmental pollution was partially negatively verified by the authors. Population has an impact on the level of environmental pollution, but it is a negative impact (increase in population causes a decrease in pollution). This discovery seems to me the most important conclusion of the whole article, the least obvious one. This may indicate a further direction of research. It seems to me that you authors focused so much on the statistical interpretation of the coefficients that they forgot about the general cognitive significance of the results obtained.

Response to points 5: thank you very much for your comments. I hope that I can improve the paper in the future.

6. Concusions and Recommendations (After correcting the above parts, this part may remain unchanged.)

This part is an original discussion of environmental pollution and its causes. Conclusions and comments, however, refer to information that was not previously included in the article.

In the first paragraph, the authors indicate that CO2 emissions in the 15 analyzed countries are increasing, while the reader only has data on CO2 emissions statistics (Table/Graph 2) and a downward trend in CO2 emissions per capita (Figure 3). I presume that the authors analyzed CO2 emissions in the analyzed countries, but did not address this situation in the Introduction, Literature Review or Data and Methodology.

Similarly, in the following sections of the Conclusions and Recommendations, based on the calculated coefficients and elasticities, the reader only knows how imports of goods and services affect pollution, while the structure of imports of the analyzed countries is unknown. These data should be entered into the article, e.g. in the Introduction/Literature Review section or possibly Data and Methodology. Without it, it's hard to find in these conclusions.

Also check out figures - you should call some of them tables. I also think that the list of references is too poor (but this is not the most important correction).

I encourage you to correct the text and resubmit it to the journal. The topic is important and current.
Kind regards,

Response to points 6: thank you very much for your comments. I already change the figure to the table according to your comments. I added the results to the abstract. I hope that the revised paper is good to you. I hope that the revised paper with the MDPI English services to be OK.