The article is well-writing, clear and unambiguous with relevant results.

References are fair.

There is only an inconsistency in the phrase "The growth rate of confirmed cases was

106 significantly decreased both in Wuhan (U = 27, P = 0.023) and Hubei (U = 23, P =

107 0.012), but in non-Hubei regions, as a contrast, changes were also significant (U = 3, P

108 < 0.001).", because non-Hubei regions also had significant p-value, so the "but" and "as a contrast" are ambiguous.

Aims and scope are well-defined.

There are some observations about the methods.

First, the normalization of ratings needs to adjust values measured on different scales to a notionally common scale, Although, for instance, authors may have break the cummulative growth of the data by the way they calculate it "Growth 74 rate of confirmed cases was calculated by dividing the new confirmed cases by the total 75 confirmed cases on the previous day.", the variance does not have a standard for all the range, so authors could use t-tests.

The author also should be aware of outliers in data, so they could hand it, because the data is too small and cannot support outliers.

After all, the violation of Independent samples/groups may be considered. For instance, the group "before" can influence the group "after", since the infected subjects can transmit to other subjects. In this case, a paired t-test may be used.

There are relevants impacts with conclusive results and meaningful replication. All underlying data have been provided.

It is na important article, reasonably well written and with findings of interest to public health policy makers. However, the methods need to be revised.