**CHANGES MADE IN RESPONSES TO REVIEWER COMMENTS – ARTICLE 1191**

All revisions were made in ‘track changes’ mode for ease of review

1. General comments: (Any comments of a general nature including language,

readability, references used or technical aspects) This is a good study, adding new information about a recent and important topic, which deserves publication. The language are in general good and attention to technical issues received attention.

Thank you – no improvements were suggested.

1. Abstract: (Does the abstract reflect the essence of the manuscript?)

The abstract is good, but is probably too long. The author should consider shortening it, if possible, without loss of the most important facts and research results. “ALT-X” should be defined in a word or two, maybe between brackets; both in the abstract and the text.

The abstract has been shortened to 319 words (within the accepted range of 200 – 400 word) by revising the first two paragraphs to eliminate extraneous information.

A short definition of the abbreviation ALT-X has been included in both the abstract and the main text.

1. Body: (Does layout of the manuscript enable the reader to ‘follow the

story line’) The layout is fine. There is fault with the numbering of the sections which is confusing. The storyline kept the reader in mind and the text is comprehensible. Some phrases should be written in more scientific language, such as “no coincidence”. The author should not make value judgements, such as “interestingly”. In the sections on the “Discussion” and “Conclusion” the author should probably not express things too strongly. Instead of saying there are no direct effects, the author might consider replacing “no” with “little”.

The numbering of sections has been rectified and is now typed in manually.

A few instances of non-scientific language or value judgements were noted when re-reading the article – ‘unsurprisingly’, ‘interestingly’ and ‘no coincidence’. These were re-worded as requested.

The Discussion and Conclusion sections have been revised to soften strongly worded negative statements by using the phrase “little to no” instead of ‘no’.

1. Originality: (Does the manuscript contain adequate new information to

justify it publication in an ISI indexed journal) The manuscript definitely contains adequate new information to justify it publication in an ISI indexed journal.

Thank you – no improvements were suggested.

1. Relationship to literature: (Does the manuscript demonstrate an adequate

understanding of relevant literature? Are appropriate sources cited?) The manuscript does demonstrate an adequate understanding of relevant literature and appropriate sources are cited. “GCR” is not found in the bibliography at the end of the manuscript.

The in-text reference ‘GCR’ is listed in the bibliography as ‘The Global Competitiveness Report (GCR)’ in the original submission. However, no definition of the abbreviation was given in the text.

I have changed both the in-text reference and the bibliography to reflect ‘The Global Competitiveness Report’. The use of the abbreviation has been eliminated entirely.

1. Research methodology: (Is the manuscript’s argument founded on an

appropriate base of theory, concepts or other ideas? Is the research on which the manuscript is based, well designed and are the methods employed appropriate?) The research methodology followed it excellent. The manuscript’s argumentation is founded on an appropriate base of theory and concepts. The research design and methods followed are appropriate to investigate the research question.

Thank you – no improvements were suggested.

1. Results: (Are the results presented clearly and analysed appropriately,

and do the conclusions adequately tie all the elements of manuscript together?) The results are reported clearly. The findings are important and interesting.

Thank you – no improvements were suggested.

1. Recommendation:

It is recommended that the manuscript be accepted for publication, after some minor improvements.