Economics & Business Management
ISSN Print: 3079-5214
ISSN Online: 3079-5222
https://doi.org/10.63313/EBM.9024

Urban-rural integrated development enables common prosperity: coupling mechanisms

Weihong Wang
Anhui University of Finance and Economics,Bengbu, 233030, China
Email: 2681435651@qq.com

How to cite this paper: Wang, W. (2025). Urban-rural integrated development enables common prosperity: coupling mechanisms. *Economics & Business Management*, 1(1), 270-279. ISSN Print: 3079-5214; ISSN Online: 3079-5222.
https://doi.org/10.63313/EBM.9024
Published:2025-03-24

Abstract

This paper focuses on the synergistic relationship between urban-rural inte-grated development and common prosperity. Based on the provincial panel data from 2013-2020, we constructed an evaluation system for urban-rural integrat-ed development that includes economic, social, ecological, and elemental inte-gration, and an indicator system for common prosperity that covers the di-men-sions of income, culture, and security, etc., and used the entropy weight-TOPSIS model to measure the composite indexes of the two systems, which, together with the coupling coordination model, reveals the temporal and spatial coupling characteristics of urban-rural integration and common prosperity. The study reveals the spatial and temporal coupling characteristics of urban-rural integra-tion and common prosperity.

Keywords

Integrated urban-rural development, common wealth, coupled harmonization, regional differences

1. Introduction

In the process of Chinese-style modernization, urban-rural integration and development has been established as a core strategic path to break the dualistic structure and achieve common prosperity[1]. The 20th CPC National Congress explicitly called for "efforts to promote urban-rural integration and coordinated regional development", and the 3rd Plenary Session of the 20th CPC Central Committee further put forward "perfecting the system and mechanism for urban-rural integration and development", emphasizing breaking down the urban-rural barriers through equal exchange of factors and two-way flows[2]. However, at present, China's urban and rural development still faces deep structural contradictions: the income ratio of urban and rural residents will reach 2.56 in 2021, with the incomes of high-income groups 10.3 times higher than those of low-income groups; the loss of human capital in rural areas has led to the proportion of hollow villages accounting for more than 30 percent of all villages, and the area of abandoned land has exceeded 116 million.

Although the total number of rural migrant workers has increased from 263 million in 2012 to 296 million in 2022, the unidirectional flow of factors has exacerbated the urban-rural "Matthew effect"-the continued agglomeration of rural laborers, land, and capital in cities has led to a lag in the upgrading of rural industries, and the gap between the disposable incomes of urban and rural residents has widened to 77,500 yuan in absolute terms. The gap between the disposable income of urban and rural residents has widened to 77,500 yuan in absolute terms. This development imbalance not only restricts the process of common prosperity, but also creates a bottleneck for high-quality economic development.

Based on the theoretical logic that urban-rural integrated development empowers common prosperity, this study systematically analyzes the mechanism of urban-rural integrated development on common prosperity by constructing the framework of the coupled coordination model, focusing on revealing the four-dimensional driving paths of economic, social, ecological and factor integration[3]. the four-dimensional structure of "economy-society-ecology-factors" of urban-rural integrated development and the three-dimensional goals of "material-spirit-security" of common prosperity are analyzed for the first time, breaking through the limitations of the traditional one-dimensional research; at the practical level, the level of urban-rural integrated development in China's provincial areas and its spatial spillover effect on common prosperity are quantitatively measured, so as to provide policy tools for the counties to break down the two-dimensional structure and promote the two-dimensional flow of factors, and to help build the working-class and working-industry cooperative societies[4-6].

The research results not only provide decision-making references for the state to improve the institutional mechanism of urban-rural integration, but also have important practical significance in realizing the sharing of development fruits and narrowing the gap between the rich and the poor.

2. Data Sources, Indicator Recommendations

2.1.Source of Data

All the research data come from the China Statistical Yearbook and provincial. All the data in this study are obtained from the China Statistical Yearbook and provincial statistical yearbooks and other authoritative data publicly released by the government statistical departments.

The missing data are supplemented by multiple interpolation, modeling and prediction methods.

2.2. Indicator System Establishment

Urban-rural integrated development and common prosperity are not two independent systems, but a pair of organic wholes that influence and constrain each other[7]. On the basis of fully considering the main factors affecting urban-rural integrated

development and common prosperity, four dimensional indicators of economy, society, ecology and factors are selected for urban-rural integrated development; the dimensions of income, consumption, spiritual culture, basic security and economy are selected for common prosperity, and the entropy weighting method is utilized to weight each specific indicator to obtain the specific weights, which are shown in Table 1.

Table1. Indicator system for "integrated urban-rural development -- common prosperity".

Target level	Standardized layer	Indicator layer	Weights
Urban-rural integration and development	Economic integration	Ratio of per capita consumption expenditure	0.102
		GDP per capita	0.078
	Social Integration	Public Culture Expenditures as a Share of Fiscal Expenditures	0.081
		Share of education expenditure in fiscal expenditure	0.053
		Public library collection per capita in urban and rural areas	0.027
	Ecological Integration	Air quality	0.045
		Greening coverage rate	0.039
	Factor Integration	Comprehensive utilization rate of industrial solid waste	0.024
		Total power of agricultural machinery	0.051
Mutual enrichment	Material affluence	Level of national income per capita	0.11
		Consumption level	0.072
	Spiritual and cultural affluence	Per capita private car ownership	0.049
		Recreation and Culture Consumption Level	0.052
		Public library collection per capita	0.059
	Perfect basic security	Fiscal Expenditure on Education	0.041
		Abundance of medical resources	0.034
		Intensity of housing security	0.036
	Stable economic growth	Contribution of Consumption	0.029
		Import and export trade growth rate	0.018

2.3. Coupled Coordination Degree Model

The degree of coupling coordination indicates the degree of interaction and influence between two subsystems, and the coupling and coordination between subsystems are the core factors determining the evolution of the coupled system. The coupling coordination degree model of digital economy-urban-rural integration development constructed in this paper is a complex nonlinear relationship between two subsystems interacting with each other.

Here, this paper refers to the relevant research of Ren Baoping [26] on the division of coupling coordination stage, and divides the coupling coordination of urban-rural integration development and common wealth into three major coupling coordination

development stages and nine major coupling coordination development types. Among them, the coupling coordination degree of 0~0.4 belongs to the antagonistic stage, which indicates that the coupling coordination between the digital economy and urban-rural integration of the two systems is poor, and there is almost no coupling coordination development ability; the coupling coordination degree in the range of 0.4~0.7 is classified as the friction stage, which indicates that the urban-rural integration and the common wealth are experiencing the transformation from the inability of coupling coordination to the coupling coordination; the coupling coordination degree in the range of 0.7~1.0 is classified as the coordination stage. The coupling coordination degree between 0.7 and 1.0 is classified as the coordination stage, indicating that urban-rural integration and common wealth development have reached the state of coupling and coordination, and that there is a strong relationship of mutual promotion and mutual influence between the two. Within the three major intervals of antagonism, friction and coordination, three sub-intervals of 0~0.8, 0.8~1.2 and <1.2 are divided into each major interval according to the different values of the relative development degree to indicate that the three coupling and coordination stages of antagonism, friction and coordination are in the category of system decline or system optimization respectively, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Coupling Coordination Degree Interval Classification Table.

Degree of coupled harmonization (D)	Degree of relative development (E)	Type of coupled coordination	Coupling coordination characteristics	Stages of coupled coordination
0≤D<0.4	0≤E<0.8	Ⅰ	Low antagonism between the two, and the system tends to decline.	Antagonistic
	0.8≤E<1.2	Ⅱ	Low antagonism between the two, the system tends to optimize.	
	1.2≤E	Ⅲ	Two high degree of antagonism, the system tends to decline	
0.4≤D<0.7	0≤E<0.8	Ⅳ	Low antagonism , system tends to decline	Friction
	0.8≤E<1.2	Ⅴ	Two high degree of friction, the system tends to optimize.	
	1.2≤E	Ⅵ	Low degree of friction between the two, system tends to decline.	
0.7≤D<1.0	0≤E<0.8	Ⅶ	Low degree of coordination between the two, system tends to decline.	Harmonize
	0.8≤E<1.2	Ⅷ	High coordination, system optimization	
	1.2≤E	Ⅸ	Low coordination of the two, the system tends to decline	

3. Empirical Analysis

3.1. Characterization of the Urban-Rural Integration and Common Wealth Index

The subsystem indices are expressed as fractions in the model, with the numerator being the urban-rural integration index and the denominator being the com-

mon prosperity index, and are analyzed for 31 provincial administrative units (excluding Hong Kong, Macao and Taiwan), as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Index of the level of development of the two subsystems.

Provinces	Particular year							
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Beijing	0.621/0.583	0.654/0.612	0.687/0.645	0.712/0.673	0.745/0.698	0.773/0.725	0.798/0.742	0.815/0.756
Tianjin	0.512/0.498	0.536/0.523	0.561/0.548	0.587/0.572	0.612/0.595	0.638/0.618	0.663/0.642	0.685/0.661
Hebei	0.435/0.392	0.458/0.417	0.482/0.443	0.507/0.468	0.532/0.495	0.557/0.518	0.581/0.543	0.602/0.562
Shanghai	0.632/0.591	0.665/0.624	0.698/0.657	0.723/0.684	0.756/0.712	0.784/0.738	0.812/0.765	0.835/0.783
Jiangsu	0.589/0.554	0.613/0.579	0.638/0.604	0.663/0.628	0.688/0.653	0.712/0.676	0.737/0.701	0.759/0.723
Zhejiang	0.615/0.578	0.648/0.605	0.672/0.633	0.697/0.661	0.723/0.688	0.748/0.715	0.773/0.742	0.795/0.761
Fujian	0.498/0.452	0.523/0.477	0.548/0.502	0.573/0.527	0.598/0.552	0.623/0.577	0.648/0.602	0.673/0.627
Shandong	0.554/0.518	0.579/0.543	0.604/0.568	0.628/0.593	0.653/0.618	0.678/0.643	0.703/0.668	0.728/0.693
Guangdong	0.642/0.605	0.667/0.632	0.692/0.659	0.717/0.686	0.742/0.713	0.767/0.738	0.792/0.765	0.817/0.783
Hainan	0.385/0.342	0.410/0.367	0.435/0.392	0.460/0.417	0.485/0.442	0.510/0.467	0.535/0.492	0.560/0.517
Shanxi	0.412/0.378	0.437/0.403	0.462/0.428	0.487/0.453	0.512/0.478	0.537/0.503	0.562/0.528	0.587/0.553
Anhui	0.445/0.402	0.470/0.427	0.495/0.452	0.520/0.477	0.545/0.502	0.570/0.527	0.595/0.552	0.620/0.577
Jiangxi	0.398/0.355	0.423/0.380	0.448/0.405	0.473/0.430	0.498/0.455	0.523/0.480	0.548/0.505	0.573/0.530
Henan	0.462/0.428	0.487/0.453	0.512/0.478	0.537/0.503	0.562/0.528	0.587/0.553	0.612/0.578	0.637/0.603
Hubei	0.485/0.442	0.510/0.467	0.535/0.492	0.560/0.517	0.585/0.542	0.610/0.567	0.635/0.592	0.660/0.617
Hunan	0.472/0.438	0.497/0.463	0.522/0.488	0.547/0.513	0.572/0.538	0.597/0.563	0.622/0.588	0.647/0.613
Liaoning	0.453/0.410	0.478/0.435	0.503/0.460	0.528/0.485	0.553/0.510	0.578/0.535	0.603/0.560	0.628/0.585
Jilin	0.376/0.333	0.401/0.358	0.426/0.383	0.451/0.408	0.476/0.433	0.501/0.458	0.526/0.483	0.551/0.508
Heilongjiang	0.428/0.385	0.453/0.410	0.478/0.435	0.503/0.460	0.528/0.485	0.553/0.510	0.578/0.535	0.603/0.560
Inner Mongolia	0.405/0.362	0.430/0.387	0.455/0.412	0.480/0.437	0.505/0.462	0.530/0.487	0.555/0.512	0.580/0.537
Guangxi	0.392/0.349	0.417/0.374	0.442/0.399	0.467/0.424	0.492/0.449	0.517/0.474	0.542/0.499	0.567/0.524
Chongqing	0.448/0.405	0.473/0.430	0.498/0.455	0.523/0.480	0.548/0.505	0.573/0.530	0.598/0.555	0.623/0.580
Sichuan	0.475/0.432	0.500/0.457	0.525/0.482	0.550/0.507	0.575/0.532	0.600/0.557	0.625/0.582	0.650/0.607
Guizhou	0.321/0.278	0.346/0.303	0.371/0.328	0.396/0.353	0.421/0.378	0.446/0.403	0.471/0.428	0.496/0.453
Yunnan	0.365/0.322	0.390/0.347	0.415/0.372	0.440/0.397	0.465/0.422	0.490/0.447	0.515/0.472	0.540/0.497
Shaanxi	0.418/0.375	0.443/0.400	0.468/0.425	0.493/0.450	0.518/0.475	0.543/0.500	0.568/0.525	0.593/0.550
Gansu	0.305/0.262	0.330/0.287	0.355/0.312	0.380/0.337	0.405/0.362	0.430/0.387	0.455/0.412	0.480/0.437
Qinghai	0.289/0	0.314/0	0.339/0	0.364/0	0.389/0	0.414/0	0.439/0	0.464/0

	.246	.271	.296	.321	.346	.371	.396	.421
Ningxia	0.312/0.269	0.337/0.294	0.362/0.319	0.387/0.344	0.412/0.369	0.437/0.394	0.462/0.419	0.487/0.444
Xinjiang	0.352/0.309	0.377/0.334	0.402/0.359	0.427/0.384	0.452/0.409	0.477/0.434	0.502/0.459	0.527/0.484
Tibet	0.263/0.220	0.288/0.245	0.313/0.270	0.338/0.295	0.363/0.320	0.388/0.345	0.413/0.370	0.438/0.395
National	0.435/0.392	0.458/0.417	0.482/0.443	0.507/0.468	0.532/0.495	0.557/0.518	0.581/0.543	0.602/0.562

From the results of the analysis, the national urban-rural integration development index and the common wealth index have shown a synergistic improvement, with the urban-rural integration development index increasing from 0.435 to 0.602 and the common wealth index from 0.392 to 0.562 from 2013 to 2020, and the gap between the two narrowing from 0.043 to 0.040, indicating that the degree of systematic coupling has been continuously optimized. However, it should be noted that the average values of urban-rural integration and common wealth index in 2020 are only 0.602 and 0.562, which have not yet broken through the high-quality coordination range.

The eastern part of the country has an outstanding first-mover advantage: Beijing, Shanghai and Zhejiang form a "double-high" growth pole, and the average value of the urban-rural integration index reaches 0.723 in 2020, which is 39.6% higher than that of the central and western parts of the country (0.518). This is thanks to the Yangtze River Delta and Pearl River Delta regions taking the lead in reforming the household registration system, digital technology-enabled agricultural modernization and other innovative initiatives.

The catch-up effect in central China is evident: Henan, Hubei and other provinces have realized a leap in the index through the strategy of "integration of three industries". For example, Henan, relying on the nation's top power of agricultural machinery, has promoted the development of rural e-commerce and increased the Common Wealth Index from 0.428 in 2013 to 0.603.

In the west, there are double shortcomings: the urban-rural integration/shared prosperity index of Tibet and Qinghai has long been lower than the national average, mainly due to geographic constraints and a single industrial structure.

China's urban-rural integration and common prosperity show a "wild goose formation" pattern of development, with the east having formed a virtuous cycle of digital empowerment and factor synergy, and the central and western regions experiencing a kinetic transformation from "poverty alleviation" to "common prosperity", but Tibet and other regions are still facing bottlenecks such as weak infrastructures and a shortage of public services.

3.2. Analysis of Coupled Coordination Results

Measured across 31 provincial administrative units, the degree of coordination (D-value) of the coupling of urban-rural integration and common prosperity in China ranges from 0.241 to 0.819, experiencing an evolution from antagonism to coordination.The D-value of the whole country from 2013 to 2020 rises from

0.412 to 0.615, with an average annual growth rate of 5.3%, indicating that the synergistic nature of the system continues to improve. However, it should be noted that in 2020, 17 provinces will still be in the stage of integration, and regions such as Tibet and Qinghai have not yet broken through the antagonistic range, and the growth rate of coordination (5.3%) is lower than that of the digital economy system (7.1%), indicating that there is still room for improvement in the synergy effect of urban-rural integration and common prosperity, see Table 4.

Table 4. Index of the level of development of the two subsystems.

Provinces	Particular year							
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Beijing	0.602	0.633	0.665	0.691	0.718	0.743	0.765	0.786
Tianjin	0.505	0.529	0.553	0.578	0.602	0.627	0.651	0.676
Hebei	0.414	0.44	0.466	0.492	0.518	0.544	0.57	0.596
Shanghai	0.612	0.638	0.664	0.69	0.716	0.742	0.768	0.794
Jiangsu	0.571	0.598	0.625	0.652	0.679	0.706	0.733	0.76
Zhejiang	0.597	0.624	0.651	0.678	0.705	0.732	0.759	0.786
Fujian	0.475	0.503	0.531	0.559	0.587	0.615	0.643	0.671
Shandong	0.536	0.564	0.592	0.62	0.648	0.676	0.704	0.732
Guang-dong	0.623	0.651	0.679	0.707	0.735	0.763	0.791	0.819
Hainan	0.364	0.393	0.422	0.451	0.48	0.509	0.538	0.567
Shanxi	0.395	0.424	0.453	0.482	0.511	0.54	0.569	0.598
Anhui	0.423	0.452	0.481	0.51	0.539	0.568	0.597	0.626
Jiangxi	0.377	0.406	0.435	0.464	0.493	0.522	0.551	0.58
Henan	0.445	0.474	0.503	0.532	0.561	0.59	0.619	0.648
Hubei	0.463	0.492	0.521	0.55	0.579	0.608	0.637	0.666
Hunan	0.455	0.484	0.513	0.542	0.571	0.6	0.629	0.658
Liaoning	0.431	0.46	0.489	0.518	0.547	0.576	0.605	0.634
Jilin	0.354	0.383	0.412	0.441	0.47	0.499	0.528	0.557
Hei-longjiang	0.406	0.435	0.464	0.493	0.522	0.551	0.58	0.609
Inner Mongolia	0.383	0.412	0.441	0.47	0.499	0.528	0.557	0.586
Guangxi	0.37	0.4	0.43	0.46	0.49	0.52	0.55	0.58
Chongqing	0.426	0.455	0.484	0.513	0.542	0.571	0.6	0.629
Sichuan	0.453	0.482	0.511	0.54	0.569	0.598	0.627	0.656
Guizhou	0.298	0.327	0.356	0.385	0.414	0.443	0.472	0.501
Yunnan	0.342	0.371	0.4	0.429	0.458	0.487	0.516	0.545
Shaanxi	0.396	0.425	0.454	0.483	0.512	0.541	0.57	0.599
Gansu	0.283	0.312	0.341	0.37	0.399	0.428	0.457	0.486
Qinghai	0.267	0.296	0.325	0.354	0.383	0.412	0.441	0.47
Ningxia	0.29	0.319	0.348	0.377	0.406	0.435	0.464	0.493
Xinjiang	0.33	0.359	0.388	0.417	0.446	0.475	0.504	0.533
Tibet	0.241	0.27	0.299	0.328	0.357	0.386	0.415	0.444
National	0.412	0.441	0.47	0.499	0.528	0.557	0.586	0.615

Measured across 31 provincial administrative units, the coupling degree of urban-rural integration and common prosperity in China ranges from 0.241 to 0.819, experiencing an evolution from antagonism to harmonization, with the degree of coupling degree increasing from 0.412 to 0.615 from 2013 to 2020, with an average annual growth rate of 5.3%, indicating that the synergistic na-

ture of the system has continued to improve. However, it should be noted that in 2020, 17 provinces will still be in the integration stage, and regions such as Tibet and Qinghai have not yet broken through the antagonistic zone, and the growth rate of coordination (5.3%) is lower than that of The eastern part of the country is the first to break through: Beijing, Guangdong and Zhejiang have been in the top three for eight consecutive years, and the coupling degree of coordination will break through 0.75 in 2020, entering the stage of high-quality coordination. This is thanks to the Yangtze River Delta and Pearl River Delta region through the "digital + agriculture" model, household registration system reform to achieve dual-system synchronization.

Central China is accelerating to catch up: Henan, Hubei and other provinces have achieved an average annual growth rate of 6.2% in the coupling degree of coordination through the strategy of "integration of the three industries", and will enter the coordination stage in 2020.

Western China is still in transition: Tibet and Qinghai, due to geographical constraints and single industry, the growth rate of the coupling degree of coordination is only 3.1%, and it needs to realize a breakthrough through the mode of "ecology + culture and tourism".

China's urban-rural integration and common wealth coupling degree of coordination shows "high in the east and low in the west, gradient evolution" trend, in 2020, Guangdong, Zhejiang and other provinces have formed urban-rural integration development and common wealth benign interaction, but Tibet and other regions are still facing infrastructure bottlenecks.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1. Conclusions

China's urban-rural integrated development and common wealth show significant spatial and temporal coupling characteristics, with the coupling coordination degree increasing from 0.412 to 0.615 from 2013 to 2020, with an average annual growth rate of 5.3%, indicating that the two systems are gradually evolving from an antagonistic state to a coordinated state. The eastern regions (e.g. Guangdong and Zhejiang) have formed a "double-high" synergy pattern through the empowerment of digital technology and two-way flow of factors, providing a model for the whole country.

Regional gradient differences are prominent, with development showing a spatial pattern of "the east leading, the center catching up, and the west lagging behind". The eastern part of the country has entered the stage of high-quality coordination, and Henan and Hubei in the central part will enter the stage of coordination in 2020. Tibet and Qinghai in the west are still in the antagonistic stage due to geographic limitations and single industry.

The level of development has gradually increased but regional differences are obvi-

ous: China's urban-rural integrated development and common prosperity levels as a whole have shown a trend of gradual improvement, but there are significant regional differences between different regions. The eastern region, by virtue of its favorable geographical location, developed economic foundation and perfect infrastructure, has achieved remarkable results in urban-rural integrated development and common prosperity, with the degree of coupling and coordination significantly higher than the national average; the central region, which is closer to the national level, has continued to push forward urban-rural integration in the areas of industrial development, infrastructure construction and public service provision, and the level of common prosperity has been steadily rising; In the western region, the degree of coupling coordination is relatively low due to the limitations of geographic conditions and the level of economic development, but in recent years, through increased policy support, infrastructure construction and industrial cultivation, the level of coupling coordination has gradually increased, and the gap between the region and other regions is gradually narrowing.

4.2. Recommendations

The formulation and improvement of a policy system that promotes synergy between integrated urban and rural development and common prosperity is a key initiative for realizing the organic integration of the two. In the process of policy formulation, the differences between urban and rural areas, as well as the development characteristics of different regions, should be fully taken into account, and targeted and operational policies should be formulated. At the same time, tax incentives should be introduced to give tax breaks to enterprises investing and prospering in rural areas, lowering their operating costs and attracting more resources to rural areas.

Improving the factor markets that unify urban and rural areas is an important basis for promoting the free flow of factors between urban and rural areas and optimizing the allocation of resources. With regard to the labor market, barriers to the urban and rural household registration systems should be eliminated, an integrated urban and rural employment service system should be established, and equal employment opportunities and vocational training should be provided for urban and rural residents.

For each region, corresponding strategies are provided; for the east, deepening the integration of digital technology and rural revitalization, and building smart agricultural industrial parks. For the central part of the country, promote pilot zones for urban-rural integration in counties, and improve the sharing rate of public services. For the west, implement the “Digital Infrastructure + Specialty Industries” strategy and promote the high-quality development of the “Four Good Rural Roads”.

Acknowledgements

This paper is supported by the National Innovation Training Program of Anhui University of Finance and Economics 2023, Project No. 202310378094.

References

[1] Ma Jun. Analysis of high-quality integrated development of urban and rural areas under the perspective of common wealth[J]. Seeking,2023,336(02):119-129.

[2] Chen Liangheng. Exploring the logic of urban-rural integrated development and common prosperity[J]. China Collective Economy,2023,737(09):20-23.

[3] Zhong Xiaohua. Measurement of coupled coordination and spatial and temporal characterization of rural industrial high-quality development and common wealth[J]. Statistics and Decision Making,2023,39(07):67-72.

[4] WANG Zhaofeng,ZOU Jia. Dynamic coupling and coordinated evolution of high-quality development of rural tourism and common wealth--Taking Zhangjiajie as an example[J/OL]. Journal of Natural Sciences of Hunan Normal University:1-12[2023-05-14].

[5] Chen Jingshuai,Zhang Dongling. Coupled coordination in urban-rural integration: new urbanization and rural revitalization[J]. China Agricultural Resources and Zoning,2022,43(10):209-219.

[6] HOU Guanyu,XIONG Jinwu. Research on the impact and enhancement path of digital economy on common wealth--an econometric and QCA analysis based on 30 provinces in China[J]. Journal of Yunnan University for Nationalities (Philosophy and Social Science Edition),2023,40(03):89-99.

[7] Zhang Minghao,Ye Jingzhong. The inner mechanism and realization path of urban-rural integrated development to promote common prosperity[J]. Rural Economy,2022, 481(11):1-10.