

## Evaluation of Urban Traditional Temples Using Cultural Tourism Potential Review Round #2

We are very pleased that your precise comments have pointed out aspects we had not fully considered, which will lead to a more advanced study. Over the past ten days, our research team has made significant efforts to update as much as possible. As a result, the direction, objectives, and assumptions of the study have been more accurately defined in the introduction. Additionally, we have newly established the concept of urban traditional temples, which has led to changes in the case studies. One temple was removed, and three temples were added, resulting in a total of seven temples being newly analyzed as examples of urban traditional temples.

Although we aimed to increase the number of case studies, we focused on the primary goal of this study, which is the foundational research for the tourism commercialization of temples. Temples that are still challenging to commercialize as tourist resources or those that prefer to remain as local religious facilities rather than tourist resources were removed. Consequently, evaluations were conducted on the seven selected temples.

There have been significant changes in our methodology as well. We extracted five attributes deemed necessary for urban traditional temples from existing studies, created an overall framework for new analysis, and established all sub-attributes as indicators and methodologies for qualitative evaluation under the analysis that both quantitative and qualitative indicators are mixed. To more accurately evaluate the qualitative indicators, we changed the previous 1-3 points scale to a 0-2 points scale. This will be further explained in Chapter 4.

*In this study, the focus was on qualitative assessments of all factors to establish evaluation criteria. An effort was made to standardize evaluations across all attraction factors using a unified scale where 0 denotes the absence of a specific quality, 1 indicates its presence to a limited extent, and 2 signifies sufficient presence. The distinction between 1 and 2 was assessed using legal minimum standards and recommended criteria*

Through the second round of reviews, many aspects of the overall study have changed, and I believe it has become closer to a more in-depth research. I sincerely thank you for this.

## Reviewer #3

### General comments

The Authors have improved many elements of the paper. They better explained the goals, context and methodological assumptions or partially results. However, in my opinion, the weakness of the study is still the small number of urban traditional temples assessed, which limits the usefulness of the results. Currently, the study can only be treated as a test of the method.

- We have increased the number of cases to seven and explained the criteria for selecting these seven temples as case studies. If other cities are considered in future research, it may be possible to undertake urban regeneration using a larger number of cases.

Moreover, the selection of attributes seems arbitrary. Based on the results of the literature review (Table 3), other sets of values can also be imagined (this is also confirmed by the erroneous appearance of "popularity" in line 200 instead of "diversity" used in the assessment). In order to further refinement, it would be necessary to formulate on a literature review an Authors' definition of tourist resources containing attributes.

- In Chapter 3, I explained why five attributes were organized into an analytical framework, and in Chapter 4, I clarified in much greater detail how scores for each item in the methodology were calculated. I redefined criteria for qualitative evaluation and reconstructed the framework for assessment to more accurately reflect these criteria in the analysis.

The significance of the study could be also increased by observing the variability of factors over time.

- I agree. However, this study certainly has its limitations, and I believe it would be beneficial to propose future research directions accordingly. Therefore, I have included this discussion in the conclusion."

The results should be presented in a way that makes the conclusions clear. The results from Table 13 should be re-analyzed. In my opinion, the conclusions regarding Integration (lines 465-469) and Diversity (lines 478-483) are incorrect. I encourage the Authors to improve the research.

- We have revised the analysis of each score indicator based on the seven case studies and newly written about the overall analysis results. With changes in the analysis metrics and resulting variations, I have almost entirely presented a new conclusion. Through this process, I believe the research has been enhanced

### Specific comments

A caption should be added to the map with the location of temples. The content of the map should be supplemented with all 25 pre-selected locations and 5 finally selected ones (6 temples were marked as selected). Without these additions, the note in line 366 about excluded objects is incomprehensible.

- We have added a map diagram in Chapter 2 that illustrates the locations of temples classified as urban temples, while explaining the concepts of mountain temples and urban temples

Is "mineral" correct in the section title on line 355?

- Line 355 regarding mineral resources has been clarified with specific wording.

The acronyms used should be explained (line 175, line 494).

- We have clearly defined the abbreviations as well