

Dear Reviewer 2

Many thanks for your time in organising and completing the review of our paper. We also appreciate the time you spent recommending improvements for the paper. We are pleased to receive a range of positive and constructive comments from the editor and two reviewers.

Reviewer #2 has described a range of recommendations. To address these, we have revised the manuscript thoroughly and modified it. She/he asked the question “There are 64 articles identified for data extraction and analysis, how many websites were included for the purposes of data extraction and analysis?” We have provided further explanation of this in the text. The reviewer also suggested communicating the limitations of the study.

Reviewer# 2 suggested that the topic of this paper is an interesting one that is deserving of attention. The literature review is helpful and highlights the ways that technology can support children's exploration of nature. We thank Reviewer#2 for appreciating our work. This reviewer also made some important observations in the Conclusion section, which we modified and thank him/ her for pointing out the irrelevancy. Also, they flagged a number of places where the meaning of sentences is unclear - we have modified the necessary sentences and added further explanations where this is useful.

We have detailed the above-mentioned revisions in the Rejoinder Table below. We thank the reviewer for their help in strengthening the paper on the topic of ‘Reconciling Nature-Technology-Child Connections: smart cities and the necessity of a new paradigm of nature-sensitive technologies for today’s children.’ We suggest this revision has improved the clarity of the paper and better communicated its novelty and innovation in line with the observations of Reviewer 2. We argue that our study advances this important topic and puts thoughtful discussion to the readers.

Yours sincerely,

The Authors

Reviewer 2

We thank Reviewer# 2 for noting that our paper's topic is an interesting one that is deserving of attention. Thank you for thoroughly reviewing the paper and noting recommended corrections in the uploaded pdf. We have listed our corrections and additional explanation in the rejoinder table below:

Table: Reviewer 2 report: Responses

Line number (markup of original manuscript)	Comments	Authors' Comment
45-46	what does attention to place mean? [13].	Such urban spaces can benefit from careful design to enhance opportunities for play and recreational activity and to simultaneously nurture an appreciation of biodiversity and nature. This holistic approach integrating consideration of children, nature and biodiversity can facilitate education, and nature positive values [13]. We have included the above discussion and appropriate references in the manuscript now.
54	Whose vision? The vision is to combine sustainable development fundamentals with information and communication technology (ICT), cloud computing, big data and the internet of things (IoT), technology [12,24] in six areas: economy, governance, people, transportation, environment and living.	“Whose vision” is a good question. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to elaborate on and clarify this point within the manuscript. Urban governments have aimed to implement smart city policies and projects for a number of reasons including the support of business, communities and citizens [102] Leading smart cities combine sustainable development fundamentals with information and communication technology (ICT), cloud computing, big data and internet of things (IoT) technology [12,24] in six areas: economy, governance, people, transportation, environment and living [14,24,83].
59	Business and economic directions: put some examples. Smart cities have to date focused on business and economic directions.	We argue that smart cities frequently have a strong corporate bias, and are driven by business interests. Eminent scholars such as Kitchin and McNeill have extensively elaborated on this point. We have included the text below to address this point. Smart cities have to date focused on business and economic directions, rather than

		supporting key demographics such as children, and this has been noted in the literature [31]. For example, Han et al (2019) suggested that smart city agendas can “reduce cities to a one-dimensional business model and series of metrics”[16] whilst Söderström et al (2020) argue that companies such as IBM have co-opted smart cities agenda as a form of corporate storytelling by presenting technological innovation as a pragmatic, and uncontroversial advance in urban development and management [18]. In his 2014 paper, Kitchin [20] elaborates on the shortcomings of much literature and urban scholarship on the smart city. Grossi and Pianezzi 2017; Kitchin 2015; Söderström et al. 2020 suggest that we need to address the needs and benefits of all citizens including children [18, 20, 99].
73	Re-write Sentence Depicting on a narrative literature review, we then enumerate nature-based applications that intrigue the users.	Modified to improve flow and readability.
82	The reviewer suggested changing the word from ‘selected’ to ‘identify.’ The authors used these keywords to develop a set of 64 papers from the relevant published literature in four high-impact electronic databases- ScienceDirect, Web of Science, IEEE, and Scopus, between 1996 and 2022.	The modified version now includes the word identified:
90	Describe the literature eligibility characteristics.	This has been addressed in greater detail in the methods section now. A systematic reading of the title and abstract text was carried out to identify which papers were going to be reviewed. Inclusion and Exclusion and inclusion characteristics were scrutinized to select relevant studies that occurred within the study’s scope. The inclusion and exclusion criteria are shown in Table 2.
96	Rewrite the sentence regarding Table 2	Revision made as suggested.
103	Unclear sentence “criteria which are well experimented with children and currently functioning in the present world right now”	Revision made to improve clarity

106	What is the process: ‘Support the process’ Other supporting information was gathered from several conference proceedings to support the process.	Revision made to improve clarity. Here we refer to the review process and methodology.
Table 2	Explain the term “unauthentic”	We have deleted the term unauthentic throughout the paper to improve clarity.
117	Explain “Data extraction is an essential system” Data extraction is an essential system and needs to be relevant to the realm of the research topic.	Thank you for the comments. We have revised this sentence.
126	Explain what “Methodological and demographical factors” means. For making recommendations and adding to the body of knowledge, these data were analysed in accordance with methodological and demographical factors based on the use of nature-based technology for children.	Thank you for the comments. We have now clarified this section using plain English. We considered those papers which focused on children and their relationship to technology and nature.
199	Reviewer asked to explain what their assigned tasks were. Due to its simplicity, teachers reported no difficulties have been found even with dealing with elementary school students and they successfully managed to carry out their assigned tasks	Thank you for the comments. We have now better explained this example in the text. This technology has demonstrated the ability to enhance enthusiasm and engagement during school and fieldwork activities. For instance, in one case, students were assigned by their teachers to visit an urban park and make a checklist regarding what they saw in their natural surroundings with the help of google glass. Teachers reported that no difficulties were found with the use of technology by the elementary school students. Nonetheless, it is important to note that the use of such technology should always be implemented with consideration for the individual’s needs and the preferences of the learners.
216	The sentence was unclear “motivated the active”	Thank you for the comments. We have rewritten this sentence. This approach not only motivated the active students but also left a positive impact on the children, even those children who are usually reluctant to participate in physical education-related activities.
219	Explanation needed regarding “conciliate child-nature reciprocity”	Thank you for the comments. We have rewritten this sentence to improve clarity. The possibilities for digital tools to be designed to encourage nature play and

		interactions with nature have been a prime focus for some scholars.
226-233	Citation needed to be added for the paragraph.	Thank you for the comments. Revision made as suggested. The citation has been added.
249	Explain “By and by, it is hoped that”	Thank you for the comments. Revision made as suggested.
274	Explain “Although most reciprocal”	Thank you for the comments. We have rephrased this paragraph. Although most interactive, nature technologies for children have been planned for formal educational rearrangement some recent initiatives have been an inspiration for more unstructured interactions considering the need for positive experiences in nature.
351-352	The sentences were quite generic. Smart sustainable cities promote children to be curious about the world around them and to use their scientific inquiry skills to learn more about things like systems, processes, and environments.	Thank you for the comments. We have enriched the discussion with specific details and examples.
374	The sentence lack relevance In cities, children have access to different spaces and enjoy opportunities for ‘independent’ play and free movement, which seem limited indoors only in the past.	Thank you for the comments. We revised this line and added a few words to make it more relevant.
478-480	The questions should be in the introduction part. This leads us to think and ask: • Can a meaningful and appropriate use of technology be thought of as a solution to reconnect children with their environment? • Is the intentional involvement of technology capable of preparing children to consider and critically engage nature?	Thank you for the comments. We have removed the entire paragraph and included a variation of it in the introduction.
544-546	Unclear sentence. Thus, technology-based settings enable more regular exposure to nature, abolishing feasibility restrictions and making it easier and more comfortable which is clearly seen as a positive.	Thank you for the comments. We have omitted this sentence for better understanding.
555-557	The statement regarding “urban design” is irrelevant. This has raised questions about their impact on how we live and work in cities, and how	Thank you for this comment. By our definition smart technologies, including mobile ones, are a key part of smart cities and are therefore of relevance to urban

	we design and build urban spaces. It's difficult for urban planners to create livable, attractive, safe, and sustainable cities when the infrastructure is constantly evolving, and children are constantly growing up learning new ways to communicate.	design. Please see Han et al 2018 for further insights and links regarding urban design and smart technologies. Picon's book "Smart Cities: A spatialised intelligence" is also helpful on this topic [121]. We have clarified the paragraph in question to communicate the above idea.
--	--	---

New References:

84. Hawken, S., H. Rahmat, S.M. Sepasgozar & K. Zhang. The SDGs, Ecosystem Services and Cities: A Network Analysis of Current Research Innovation for Implementing Urban Sustainability, Sustainability, 2021, 13(24), 14057.

85. Wendling, L.A., A. Huovila, M. zu Castell-Rüdenhausen, M. Hukkalainen & M. Airaksinen. Benchmarking Nature-Based Solution and Smart City Assessment Schemes Against the Sustainable Development Goal Indicator Framework, Frontiers in Environmental Science, 2018, 6, 69.

88. Wang, D., T. Zhou & M. Wang. Information and communication technology (ICT), digital divide and urbanization: Evidence from Chinese cities, Technology in Society, 2021, 64, 101516.

94. Ferron, M., Leonardi, C., Massa, P., Schiavo, G., Murphy, A.L., & Farella, E. A Walk on the Child Side: Investigating Parents' and Children's Experience and Perspective on Mobile Technology for Outdoor Child Independent Mobility. Proc of Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300827>

95. Cumbo, B.J., Leong, T.W. Wearable audio-video recorders as a tool for investigating child play experiences in nature. OzCHI '15: Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Australian Special Interest Group for Computer Human Interaction, 2015, 618–622, <https://doi.org/10.1145/2838739.2838822>

96. Stymne, J. Outdoor learning with mobile technology: A systematic review, IADIS International Journal on www/Internet, 2020, 18(1), 76-106.

97. Williams, M., Jones, O., Fleuriot, C & Wood, L. Children and emerging wireless technologies: Investigating the potential for spatial practice, Proc of ACM CHI, 2005, 819-828. 10.1145/1054972.1055088.

98. Beery, T., Jørgensen, K.A. Children in Nature: Sensory Engagement and the Experience of Biodiversity. Env Edu Research, 2018, 24 (1), 13–25. doi:10.1080/13504622.2016.1250149

99. Grossi, G. & D. Pianezzi. Smart cities: Utopia or neoliberal ideology?, Cities, 2017, 69, 79–85.

100. Van Deursen, A.J. & K. Mossberger. Anything for anyone? A new digital divide in internet-of-things skills, Policy & internet, 2018, 10(2), 122–40.

101. Toft, T.S. Social Media Platforms as Strategic Models for Local Community Development, Weimar, 2010.

102. Hsu, Y.-Y., S. Hawken, S. Sepasgozar & Z.-H. Lin. Beyond the Backyard: GIS Analysis of Public Green Space Accessibility in Australian Metropolitan Areas, Sustainability, 2022, 14(8), 4694

103. Colding, J. & S. Barthel. An urban ecology critique on the "Smart City" model, Journal of Cleaner Production, 2017, 164, 95–101.

104. Ertl, T., C. Müller, K. Aal, V. Wulf, F. Tachtler, L. Scheepmaker, G. Fitzpatrick, N. Smith & D. Schuler. Ethical future environments: Smart thinking about smart cities means engaging with its most vulnerable, in C&T'21: Proc of the 10th Intl Conf on Communities & Technologies-Wicked Problems in the Age of Tech, 2021, 340–45.
105. Fernanda Medina Macaya, J., S. Ben Dhaou & M.A. Cunha. Gendering the Smart Cities: Addressing gender inequalities in urban spaces, in Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Theory and Practice of Electronic Governance, 2021, 398–405.
106. Galle, N.J., S.A. Nitoslawski & F. Pilla. The Internet of Nature: How taking nature online can shape urban ecosystems, *The Anthropocene Review*, 2019, 6(3), 279–87.
107. Garau, C., A. Annunziata & D. Vale. Smart city governance and children's rights: perspectives and findings from literature on natural elements influencing children's activities within public spaces, in Computational Science and Its Applications–ICCSA 2019: 19th International Conference, Saint Petersburg, Russia, July 1–4, 2019, Proceedings, Part VI 19, Springer, 152–68.
108. Joelsson, T. Smart cities, smart mobilities, and children, in *Gendering Smart Mobilities*. 2019, Routledge, 94–108.
109. Littke, H. Becoming biophilic: Challenges and opportunities for biophilic urbanism in urban planning policy, *Smart and Sustainable Built Environment*, 2016, 5(1), 15–24.
110. Liu, D., R. Huang, M. Wosinski, D. Liu, R. Huang & M. Wosinski. Multicultural perspective on smart learning in smart cities, *Smart learning in smart cities*, 2017, 217–32.
111. Maalsen, S., P. Wolifson & R. Dowling. Gender in the Australian innovation ecosystem: Planning Smart cities for men, *Gender, Place & Culture*, 2023, 30(2), 299–320.
112. Malone, K. & J. Rudner. Child-friendly and sustainable cities: Exploring global studies on children's freedom, mobility, and risk, *Young*, 2015, 12, 1.
113. Masucci, M., H. Pearsall & A. Wiig. The smart city conundrum for social justice: Youth perspectives on digital technologies and urban transformations, *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 2020, 110(2), 476–84.
114. Peacock, S., A. Puusaar & C. Crivellaro. Sensing our streets: Involving children in making people-centred smart cities, in *The Routledge Handbook of Placemaking*. Routledge, 2022, 130–40.
115. Prebble, S., J. McLean & D. Houston. Smart urban forests: An overview of more-than-human and more-than-real urban forest management in Australian cities, *Digital Geography and Society*, 2021, 2, 100013.
116. Sergeyeva, O. & E. Laktukhina. Child in "smart city" social studies review of children's mobility, in Proceedings of the International Conference on Electronic Governance and Open Society: Challenges in Eurasia, 2016, 31–34.
117. Shin, S.-Y., D. Kim & S.A. Chun. Digital divide in advanced smart city innovations, *Sustainability*, 2021, 13(7), 4076.
118. Van der Graaf, S. The right to the city in the platform age: Child-friendly city and smart city premises in contention, *Information*, 2022, 11(6), 285.
120. Picon, A. *Smart cities: a spatialised intelligence*, AD Primers. 2015, Wiley, Chichester, England.