

Research on Value Evaluation and Protective Development Strategies for Chongqing's Port-Opening Heritage Park

Dian Dang, Jinxin Lv, Yuling Weng, Xudong Li

Chongqing University of Science and Technology, Chongqing 401331, China

Copyright: © 2025 Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), permitting distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is cited.

Abstract: This study focuses on Chongqing's Port-Opening Heritage Park, employing a combination of the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) and Fuzzy Comprehensive Evaluation Method. Through expert interviews and the quantitative analysis of 492 valid questionnaire responses, the park's comprehensive value was assessed. The findings indicate that the park's comprehensive value score is 3.205 out of 5, placing it at an above-average level. Among the evaluated aspects, social value performed the best, while historical and cultural values were balanced. However, there is room for improvement in ecological and scientific values. Based on the evaluation results, this paper proposes protective development strategies, including deepening cultural experiences and educational functions, innovating historical narratives and intangible cultural heritage revitalization, developing low-impact and high-value-added business formats, strengthening ecological interpretation and scientific planning, and fostering value consensus through targeted communication and dynamic feedback mechanisms. This research provides theoretical and practical foundations for the sustainable development of heritage parks and offers insights for the protection and development of similar cultural heritage sites.

Keywords: Chongqing's Port-Opening Heritage Park; Value evaluation; Protective development; Analytic Hierarchy Process; Fuzzy comprehensive evaluation; Cultural heritage protection

Online publication: October 29, 2025

1. Introduction

The "14th Five-Year Plan" for the cultural and tourism development of Chongqing proposes to strengthen the protection of open historical and cultural resources and to construct Chongqing's Port-Opening Heritage Park. The Chongqing Port-Opening Heritage Park is an important part of China's historical and cultural heritage, bearing witness to the historical development of Chongqing as a vital inland commercial and trade port. On December 5, 2019, the fourth special session of the Municipal Planning Committee reviewed and approved the "Research on the Site Selection and Planning Scheme for the Port-Opening Cultural Heritage Park (Draft for Review)." In

2020, it was designated as a key project by the Chongqing Municipality. Research on the value assessment of cultural heritage parks is relatively scarce in China. This study takes the Chongqing Port-Opening Heritage Park as its research subject, clarifies the research direction supported by the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) theory, organizes the constituent dimensions of the park, determines weight values, and combines quantitative data from questionnaires to analyze the value deficiencies of the park and explore strategies for its protective development, promoting sustainable development of the heritage park.

2. Literature review on value assessment and protective development strategies for the Chongqing Port-Opening Heritage Park

2.1. Development trajectory of heritage park research

As a unique form of urban space, the development of heritage parks reflects the evolution of cultural heritage protection concepts and practices. According to the “Classification Standard for Urban Green Spaces” (CJJ/T85-2017), a heritage park is defined as “a green space constructed primarily around a heritage site and its surrounding environment, serving functions such as protection, display, and recreation”^[1].

Early research primarily focused on its protective functions. For instance, Shan Jixiang proposed the “Two Zones, Three Lines” framework for the protection of large heritage sites, emphasizing the need for spatial planning to ensure the integrity of the heritage sites themselves^[2]. Scholars such as Li Aimin et al. used Xi’an as a case study to construct a “cultural-ecological corridor” heritage park. They pointed out that the naming paradox of the “Archaeological Heritage Park” at Yuanmingyuan could potentially lead to a leisure-oriented trend in heritage protection areas, calling for a balance between protection and utilization^[3–5]. The protective practices at Hadrian’s Wall, for example, integrated archaeological maintenance with visitor management through heritage management planning, laying the institutional foundation for heritage parks^[6]. Capozzi et al., using the example of the Baiae Ancient Baths, proposed that collaborative design between architecture and urban planning is an effective approach to revitalizing heritage sites^[7]. Mauro et al. focused on the impact of environmental factors on heritage sites, highlighting the necessity of scientific restoration techniques^[8].

As practice deepened, scholars gradually recognized the multifaceted values of heritage parks. Wu Xin et al. proposed a cultural-ecological synergistic development model, emphasizing that heritage parks should balance cultural preservation with ecological enhancement functions^[9]. Zhang Jianzhong et al., from a tourism perspective, defined heritage parks as a new industry format integrating tourism and culture, stressing the enhancement of visitor experiences through resource activation^[10]. Huang Chenyang et al. described heritage parks as both a “special form of urban park” and an important vehicle for tracing history and promoting culture, advocating for designs that balance preservation with activation^[11]. Tao Li et al. noted that the “park” attribute allows cultural heritage resources to be transformed into tourist attractions through moderate development^[12]. Dai Juncheng emphasized the need to align heritage preservation, cultural dissemination, and public services based on site types and regional characteristics^[13]. Internationally, Romeril and Fuller were early advocates for the educational and community development roles of heritage parks, while Gerlach and Kinossian explored the significance of heritage imagery in constructing local identity^[14–15]. Szromek et al. examined business model transformations in industrial heritage tourism, Bayramova et al. highlighted the need to expand evaluation dimensions for recreational potential in historical parks, and Korunovski and Marinoski emphasized clustered development models for cultural tourism^[16–18].

In recent years, emerging concepts such as digitalization and inclusive tourism have been introduced into heritage park research. Vahtar-Jurković et al. even incorporated climate change into preservation frameworks, marking a trend toward diversified research perspectives^[19–21]. Future studies should further explore directions such as digitalization and community engagement^[22].

Overall, heritage site parks have evolved from single venues for cultural relic protection into comprehensive spaces that integrate preservation, tourism, education, community participation, and sustainable development. This evolution reflects a deepening understanding of heritage value and innovation in management models.

2.2. Literature review on value assessment studies

In recent years, scholars have systematically evaluated the comprehensive value of heritage sites by constructing multi-dimensional and multi-level evaluation systems. The Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) and other methods have been widely adopted in academia to build multi-dimensional value evaluation systems that encompass historical, cultural, ecological, and economic dimensions.

Guo Jinyu conducted an in-depth exploration of the AHP method itself, enriching its application foundation in heritage evaluation^[23]. The determination of indicator weights often relies on expert judgment, lacking validation from public perception data^[24].

2.3. Literature review on protective development strategies

The core of protective development lies in balancing the conflict between conservation and development. International studies have shown that S Amin et al. employed qualitative methods to propose that historical parks serve as an alternative concept that combines the interests of preserving historical heritage with inclusive tourism^[25]. V Bayramova et al. advocate that, among the primary tasks of effectively managing historical parks, efforts should not only be made to protect the park but also to create year-round public appeal and develop special recreational programs^[26]. Domestic research exhibits a case-oriented characteristic. Mei Qing et al. pointed out that the tourism development of historical districts relies on policy support and resource integration, as demonstrated by cases such as Pingyao and Lijiang^[27]. Wang Xiaoling et al. argued that scientific resource evaluation is the foundation for avoiding overdevelopment^[28].

Overall, the development of heritage parks should be tailored to local conditions, balancing ecological protection and cultural inheritance. Future research could further explore the synergistic mechanisms between technological innovation and community participation^[28, 30].

3. Research methodology and data sources

3.1. Research methodology

3.1.1. Analytic Hierarchy Process

The Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) is a multi-level weighted decision-making analysis method. It involves decomposing the overall research objective into multiple levels and indicators, conducting pairwise comparisons and assigning values, and ultimately calculating the weights of various factors. This study employs the AHP method to evaluate the multidimensional value of the Chongqing Port Opening Heritage Park.

3.1.2. Expert interview method

To scientifically and reasonably assess the actual value of the Chongqing Port Opening Heritage Park, this study

adopts the Delphi expert evaluation method, inviting six experts from relevant fields to form an evaluation team. The 1-to-9 scaling method, combined with a random consistency RI table, is utilized to ensure the reliability and validity of the evaluation results (Tables 1 and 2).

Table 1. Random index (RI)

Order (n)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
RI value	0	0	0.52	0.89	1.12	1.26	1.36	1.41	1.46

Table 2. Scaling method

Scale a_{ij}	Meaning / Definition
1	Factor i and j are equally important
3	Factor i is slightly more important than j
5	Factor i is strongly more important than j
7	Factor i is very strongly more important than j
9	Factor i is absolutely more important than j
2, 4, 6, 8	Intermediate values between two adjacent judgments
$a_{ij}=1/a_{ji}$ (1/2, 1/3, 1/4.....1/9)	If factor i has one of the above numbers assigned to it when compared to j, then j has the reciprocal value when compared to i.

3.1.3. Fuzzy comprehensive evaluation method

The fuzzy comprehensive evaluation method is used to address the fuzziness in indicator evaluations, particularly in situations where precise quantification is not feasible. This study conducts a comprehensive evaluation based on fuzzy matrices and weight vectors, deriving an overall assessment of the Chongqing Port Opening Heritage Park.

3.2. Data sources

This study collected a total of 492 valid questionnaires, with a well-represented sample covering different genders, educational backgrounds, and geographical regions, ensuring the broad applicability of the results.

3.3. Construction of the indicator system

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) adopted the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage in Paris, proposing Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) as the core criterion for selecting World Heritage sites and promoting effective protection of cultural and natural heritage through international cooperation. On this basis, China has successively introduced and developed the three core values of history, art, and science in the “China Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites” as the foundation for heritage assessment. At the same time, it has extended local practices to include expanded dimensions such as cultural value and social value, forming a more comprehensive value judgment system. In recent years, the policy landscape has also continuously enriched the connotations of heritage value. The “14th Five-Year Plan” emphasizes promoting the economic transformation of cultural heritage resources, while the “Opinions on Strengthening the Construction of Ecological Civilization” points out that heritage sites should simultaneously plan for their ecological functions. Building on this foundation and

incorporating the research findings of previous scholars such as Wang Xinwen et al., this study constructs a value assessment indicator system for the Kaibu Heritage Site Park in Chongqing ^[31].

Table 3. Value indicator system

Objective layer	Criterion layer	Indicator layer
Treaty Port Site Park (A)	B1 Historical Value	Historical Antiquity (Time Depth) Historical Significance Historical Richness/Diversity
	B2 Cultural Value	Cultural Diversity Cultural Representativeness Cultural Continuity
	B3 Economic Value	Environmental Support Conditions Related Resource Conditions Economic Feasibility of Regeneration
	B4 Social Value	Science Popularization & Educational Value Emotional/Sentimental Value Recreational Experience Quality
	B5 Ecological Value	Ecological Sensitivity Landscape Spatial Combination Coverage Rate of Environmentally Friendly Facilities
	B6 Scientific Value	Scientific Planning Construction Technology Level Digital Scientific Presentation

4. Research process

4.1. Overview of the research area

The Kaibu Heritage Site Park is located on Ma'anshan Hill along Nanbin Road in Chongqing. Its history can be traced back to the opening of Chongqing as a port in 1891. It was once a hub for foreign consulates, foreign firms, and trading companies, witnessing Chongqing's modernization as the first treaty port in the upper reaches of the Yangtze River. This event marks a significant chapter in the history of the upper Yangtze River region and serves as a testament to China's further descent into a semi-feudal and semi-colonial society. It had a profound impact on the politics, economy, society, and culture of Chongqing and the entire upper Yangtze River region. As Chongqing has intensified its efforts to preserve and inherit historical and cultural heritage in urban and rural construction, the park has now become an important heritage site that showcases the integration of commerce, diplomacy, and culture during the port-opening period.

4.2. Determining indicator weights

The maximum eigenvalue of the criterion-level matrix is 6.000, with a Consistency Index (CI) value of 0, a Consistency Ratio (CR) value of 0, and a Random Index (RI) value of 1.260. These results indicate that the judgment matrix is consistent, with a high level of agreement among the experts' evaluations, suggesting strong reliability of the assessment results (**Table 4**).

Table 4. AHP hierarchical weight table for the Kaibu Heritage Site Park

Objective layer A	Criterion layer B	Weight	Indicator layer C	Weight	Global weight
Treaty Port Site Park	Historical Value	0.1884	Historical Antiquity	0.2668	0.0503
			Historical Significance	0.4249	0.08
			Historical Richness	0.3083	0.0581
	Cultural Value	0.1884	Cultural Diversity	0.2773	0.0522
			Cultural Representativeness	0.2941	0.0554
			Cultural Continuity	0.4286	0.0807
	Economic Value	0.1750	Environmental Support Conditions	0.2824	0.0494
			Related Resource Conditions	0.3467	0.0607
			Economic Feasibility of Regeneration	0.3709	0.0649
	Social Value	0.2000	Science Education Value	0.3008	0.0602
			Emotional Value	0.3984	0.0797
			Recreational Experience	0.3008	0.0602
	Ecological Value	0.1382	Ecological Sensitivity	0.3949	0.0546
			Landscape Spatial Combination	0.3194	0.0441
			Coverage of Eco-friendly Facilities	0.2857	0.0395
	Scientific Value	0.1100	Planning Scientificity	0.3740	0.0411
			Construction Technology Level	0.2764	0.0304
			Digital Scientific Presentation	0.3496	0.0385

4.3. Questionnaire data analysis

A reliability and validity test was conducted on the 492 valid questionnaires collected. For reliability analysis, Cronbach's alpha coefficient and Composite Reliability (CR) were used as indicators. The results showed that the alpha coefficients for all six latent variables exceeded 0.91, and the CR values were all above 0.92, indicating a high level of internal consistency in the scale (**Table 5**). Validity was assessed using standardized factor loading coefficients and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values. All standardized factor loading coefficients for the measurement items were greater than 0.86, indicating strong explanatory power of the measurement items for the latent variables. The AVE values for all six dimensions were above 0.5, ranging from 0.789 to 0.824, confirming that the scale possesses good convergent validity and that the measurement items effectively reflect the characteristics of the latent variables.

Table 5. Proportion of evaluator comments for each indicator

Specific indicator C	Very unimportant	Relatively unimportant	Neutral	Relatively important	Very important
Historical Antiquity	0.1179	0.2093	0.1260	0.3476	0.1992
Historical Significance	0.1057	0.2012	0.1545	0.3537	0.1850
Historical Richness	0.1423	0.1768	0.1565	0.2947	0.2297
Cultural Diversity	0.1016	0.2439	0.1138	0.3598	0.1809
Cultural Representativeness	0.1057	0.2276	0.1585	0.3171	0.1911
Cultural Continuity	0.1037	0.2256	0.1484	0.3252	0.1972
Environmental Support Conditions	0.1382	0.2581	0.1402	0.3150	0.1484
Related Resource Conditions	0.1423	0.2358	0.1728	0.2866	0.1626
Economic Feasibility of Regeneration	0.1606	0.2500	0.1484	0.2846	0.1565
Science Education Value	0.1138	0.2195	0.1606	0.3272	0.1789
Emotional Value	0.1037	0.2093	0.1890	0.3211	0.1768
Recreational Experience	0.1179	0.2053	0.1850	0.2927	0.1992
Ecological Sensitivity	0.1382	0.2337	0.1159	0.3516	0.1606
Landscape Spatial Combination	0.1341	0.2134	0.1524	0.3272	0.1728
Coverage of Eco-friendly Facilities	0.1565	0.2073	0.1667	0.2825	0.1870
Planning Scientificity	0.1850	0.1829	0.1098	0.3374	0.1850
Construction Technology Level	0.1667	0.1789	0.1646	0.3171	0.1728
Digital Scientific Presentation	0.1341	0.2256	0.1341	0.3049	0.2012

4.4. Fuzzy comprehensive evaluation

The study employed the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) weight vector and the fuzzy relation matrix derived from the questionnaire data to conduct a fuzzy comprehensive evaluation. The weights for each dimension were normalized, and the fuzzy evaluation results for each dimension were calculated. Finally, by multiplying the weight matrix of the objective level with the membership relation matrix of the criterion level, the comprehensive evaluation result for the Chongqing Port Opening Heritage Park was obtained. After defuzzification, the overall value development score for the Chongqing Port Opening Heritage Park was 3.205, indicating that the park's comprehensive value is at a moderately high level.

5. Analysis of comprehensive evaluation results

5.1. Analysis of indicator weights

The results show that the comprehensive value score of Chongqing's Port-Opening Heritage Park is 3.205 points (out of a total of 5 points), placing it between neutral and relatively important, leaning towards the relatively important level. This indicates that the overall value development is at an above-average level. Furthermore, an analysis of the basic values reveals that the social value score is the highest, benefiting from the outstanding contributions of emotional value and popular science education, reflecting the public's strong demand for cultural

identity and the educational functions of the heritage site. The historical and cultural values exhibit balanced performance, but cultural continuity outperforms historical longevity, indicating that the public is more concerned with the living transmission of heritage culture rather than mere historical antiquity. In terms of economic value, the scores for regenerative economic viability and related resource conditions are relatively high, suggesting that the park has certain potential to drive regional development. The ecological and scientific values are relatively lower, but ecological sensitivity and planning scientificity still perform well, indicating that there is already a foundation for protecting nature and scientific presentation, yet there is still room for improvement.

5.2. Analysis of questionnaire survey results

Ratings for dimensions such as historical importance, cultural diversity, and ecological sensitivity are concentrated on “relatively important”, showing a high level of public recognition for these core values. Regenerative economic viability has a relatively high proportion of ratings in the “very unimportant” category, indicating a divergence in understanding regarding economic sustainability. Planning scientificity has the highest proportion of ratings in the “very unimportant” category, reflecting a lack of recognition for planning scientificity among some respondents. Overall, ratings for historical, cultural, and social value dimensions are relatively concentrated, while recognition for economic, ecological, and scientific value dimensions is more dispersed, indicating that a value consensus is still in the process of formation.

6. Recommendations for protective development strategies of Chongqing’s Port-Opening Heritage Park

Based on the comprehensive value assessment results of Chongqing’s Port-Opening Heritage Park, the following reasons underpin the recommendations for its protective development:

Firstly, the highest social value score indicates a strong public demand for cultural identity and educational functions. Therefore, it is recommended to deepen cultural experiences and expand educational collaborations, such as developing immersive projects and customized research courses, to consolidate this advantage.

Secondly, while historical and cultural values are balanced, cultural continuity garners more attention, indicating the public’s preference for living heritage transmission over mere historical antiquity. Therefore, it is necessary to innovate historical narratives and plan activities to revitalize intangible cultural heritage, thereby enhancing cultural appeal. The tangibility of history can be strengthened through immersive theater experiences and collaborating with local cultural and creative enterprises to co-develop port-themed markets.

Although there is potential for economic value, the questionnaire reveals significant disagreement regarding the “economic viability of regeneration.” Thus, it is recommended to develop business formats with low interference and high cultural added value, balance development and conservation through regional collaboration and a revenue-reinvestment mechanism, and disclose data on regional economic impact.

Ecological and scientific values are relatively low, but ecological sensitivity is acceptable. Therefore, it is necessary to enhance public awareness through visual ecological interpretation and transparent scientific planning. The ecological value of the park should be improved by adding green corridors and plant species. By employing green infrastructure construction and intelligent display systems, the “visibility” and “perceptibility” of ecological and scientific functions can be enhanced. Finally, given the differences in value perception across dimensions, it is recommended to adopt targeted communication and dynamic feedback mechanisms to gradually foster a

consensus on values. Meanwhile, hierarchical protection and technical monitoring should be implemented to ensure that development does not compromise the safety of the site itself, ultimately achieving a win-win scenario of cultural preservation, public education, ecological protection, and sustainable economic development.

This study systematically applies the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) and fuzzy comprehensive evaluation method to the multidimensional value assessment of the Chongqing Port Opening Heritage Park, constructs a six-dimensional indicator system with local cultural characteristics, and proposes differentiated conservation strategies based on public perception differences, enriching the quantitative research approach for port-type heritage sites. However, the study has limitations: the sample is primarily concentrated in Chongqing and does not fully represent other audiences; a dynamic feedback mechanism, such as regular questionnaires and big data monitoring, has not been established; and the development strategies do not address financial investment and institutional safeguard mechanisms, necessitating further exploration.

Funding

Graduate Innovation Program Project of Chongqing University of Science and Technology, Project Number: YKJCX2420810.

Disclosure statement

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Ministry of Housing and Urban-Rural Development, 2017, Standard for Classification of Urban Green Space: CJJ/T 85—2017. China Architecture & Building Press, Beijing.
- [2] Shan JX, 2010, Exploration and Practice of Large-Scale Archaeological Site Parks. *Chinese Cultural Heritage Research*, 2010(1): 2–12.
- [3] Li AM, 2010, The Advantages of Archaeological Site Parks in the Protection of Major Archaeological Sites in China. *Social Scientist*, 2010(9): 96–98.
- [4] Zhu XW, 2011, Research on Urban Cultural Ecosystem Based on Archaeological Site Parks: A Case Study of Xi'an. *Human Geography*, 26(2): 112–115 + 36.
- [5] Que WM, 2015, The Nomenclature Paradox of “Archaeological Site Parks”: A Case Study of the “Yuanmingyuan Ruins Park”. *Chinese Cultural Heritage*, 2015(5): 56–61.
- [6] Humphrey Welfare, Zhang YM, Yu B, 2018, Conservation and Strategic Management of Hadrian's Wall. *Chinese Cultural Heritage*, 2018(3): 71–77.
- [7] Capozzi R, Picone A, Visconti F, 2016, Archaeology, Architecture and City: The Enhancement Project of the Archaeological Park of the Baths of Baiae. *ArchNet-IJAR: International Journal of Architectural Research*, 10(1): 113–130.
- [8] Mauro A, Brunetti B, Cattazzo S, et al., 2025, Condition Survey of Tavole Palatine and Metaponto Archaeological Site Park. *Springer Proceedings in Materials*, 2025(70): 94–108. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-87068-2_7
- [9] Wu X, Cui P, 2016, Analysis of Place Attachment Characteristics in Historical Site Parks: A Case Study of Xi'an Qujiangchi Relics Park. *Journal of Northwest University (Natural Science Edition)*, 46(4): 606–610.

- [10] Zhang JZ, Sun GN, 2012, Heritage Parks: A New Form of Cultural Heritage Experience Tourism Development—A Case Study of Three Major Heritage Parks in Xi'an. *Human Geography*, 27(1): 142–146.
- [11] Huang CY, He JX, Tuo BF, et al., 2023, Research on Viewing Space Optimization Based on Dynamic and Static Visual Landscape Evaluation: A Case Study of Yangjiacheng Heritage Park in Shenmu City. *Planners*, 39(4): 93–100.
- [12] Tao L, Zhao YC, 2020, Research on the Tourism Development Path of National Archaeological Heritage Parks Based on Typological Characteristics. *Journal of Yunnan Minzu University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*, 37(3): 75–80.
- [13] Dai JC, 2023, Path Analysis of Research on National Cultural Parks. *Tourism Tribune*, 38(6): 40–51.
- [14] Romeril M, Fuller RA, 1985, Tourism and Heritage in the United Kingdom. *The Environmentalist*, 5(4): 306–309.
- [15] Gerlach J, Kinossian N, 2016, Cultural Landscape of the Arctic: “Recycling” of Soviet Imagery in the Russian Settlement of Barentsburg, Svalbard (Norway). *Polar Geography*, 39(1): 1–19.
- [16] Szromek AR, Krzysztof H, Mateusz N, 2021, Sustainable Development of Industrial Heritage Tourism: A Case Study of the Industrial Monuments Route in Poland. *Tourism Management*, 2021(83): 104252.
- [17] Bayramova V, Kryukovskiy A, Kupriianova A, et al., 2021, Modern Challenges in the Comprehensive Assessment of the Recreational Potential of Historical Parks. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 876(1): 012011.
- [18] Korunovski S, Marinoski N, 2012, Cultural Tourism in Ohrid as a Selective Form of Tourism Development. *Procedia — Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2012(44): 104–113.
- [19] Galicz IV, Magda R, David LD, 2024, Archaeological Parks in the Service of Tourism: A Comparative Analysis of Hungarian and Western European Archaeological Parks. *Sustainability*, 16(8): 3313.
- [20] Amin S, Pramono SE, Kurniawan GF, 2021, Historical Park Development for Inclusive Tourism in Semarang. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 747(1): 012043.
- [21] Vahtar-Jurkovic K, Sokol Jurkovic R, Jurkovic J, 2024, The Park Heritage of the Island of Krk amidst Urban Transformations and Climate Change. *Land*, 13(7): 1024.
- [22] Xi YT, Luo S, Han YR, 2024, Visual Analysis of Research Literature on National Archaeological Site Parks. *Journal of Xi'an University of Finance and Economics*, 37(3): 118–128.
- [23] Guo JY, Zhang ZB, Sun QY, 2008, Research and Application of the Analytic Hierarchy Process. *China Safety Science Journal*, 2008(5): 148–153.
- [24] Deng X, Li JM, Zeng HJ, et al., 2012, Analysis of Weight Calculation Methods in Analytic Hierarchy Process and Its Application Research. *Mathematics in Practice and Theory*, 42(7): 93–100.
- [25] Amin S, Pramono SE, Kurniawan GF, 2021, Historical Park of Inclusive Tourism Development in Semarang. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 2021.
- [26] Bayramova V, Kryukovskiy A, Kupriianova A, et al., 2021, Modern Problems of Comprehensive Assessment of Recreational Potential in Historical Parks. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 2021.
- [27] Mei Q, Bai CY, Sun SR, et al., 2007, Empirical Research on Protective Tourism Development in Historical Districts. *Commercial Research*, 2007(1): 167–169.
- [28] Wang XL, Ma XN, Yuan N, et al., 2012, Research on Tourism Resource Evaluation and Protective Development Based on AHP Method: A Case Study of Wudang Mountain World Heritage Site. *Resource Development & Market*, 28(10): 938–940 + 867.
- [29] Jiang XB, Liu S, Lai QH, 2010, Research on Protective Development of Ethnic Village Tourism: A Case Study of Yishala Village in Panzhihua. *China Business & Trade*, 2010(18): 82–83.

- [30] Chen WJ, Chen HL, Fang YY, 2007, Inheritance and Protective Development of Characteristic Ancient Residential Culture. *Commercial Times*, 2007(36): 97–98 + 62.
- [31] Wang XW, Liu S, 2023, Research on the Value Evaluation Method of Large Sites from the Perspective of Archaeological Site Parks: A Concurrent Discussion on the Value Evaluation of Tongwancheng Site. *Southeast Culture*, 2023(1): 13–23.

Publisher's note

Bio-Byword Scientific Publishing remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.