November 08, 2013

To the Editor:

Many thanks to you and the referees for the helpful comments we received on our paper “***The economic impact of hunting: a regional approach***.”

We have worked to respond to the referees comments. Here we provide an overview of the changes we have made. We have put the referees’ comments in *italics* to make the discussion clearer.

**Reviewer B:**

1. *Language editing is essential.*

The document was send for a second round of language editing.

1. *Firearm licences are not simply obtained for a hunting trip - there is a long process involved.*

The reviewer is wright, and we changed it to hunting permits only.

1. *A number of models are mentioned to obtain results, but not which specific ones and how the results were arrived at.*

These two sections were combined and the applied methodology was described in more detail and also more clearly.

1. *Obviously the study was done during the economic boom, but some allowance has to be made for the current downturn in the economy (e.g. SAM prices).*

The use of multiplier analysis is justified in the final paragraph of Section 4.6.

1. *Obviously a lot of work went into the tables, how were the results arrived at?*

This is explained more clearly in Section 4.6.

1. *The conclusion is totally inadequate - How can one help product owners to decide where to develop game farms - What suggestions do the authors have for policy formulation?*

This has been rewritten, to be more clearly and more relevant to the research.

All the above errors were corrected as suggested by the reviewer.

We would like to thank the reviewer for his/her positive feedback.

**Reviewer F:**

1. *Combine sections into a single section with the header “Measuring economic impact”.*

This was done. These two sections were combined and the applied methodology was described in more detail and also more clearly.

1. *The list of references is impressive, but I am not convinced that all the references are necessary - I did not check individual references. Please check, however, that the references are correct, for instance the Conningarth (2006a; 2006b and 2010) references refer to Mafikeng as the place of publication - is this correct?*

References were checked and corrections made where necessary. The Conningarth reference was corrected.

1. *The tables are a bit confusing. It really doesn’t make sense, given the size of the values to use normal rand values (including cents!). I want to suggest that all tables be reformatted in R-millions with no commas as separators and using a (.) as decimal indicator with only 1 decimal. In Table 4 it is obvious that not all the figures are in millions as indicated in the footnote. This inconsistency made it difficult to check calculations.*

The authors did make the changes as indicated by the reviewer.

1. *Other comments…*
* *Page 1 paragraph 3 starting with “The combined contribution …” second row insert a reference ( a value of R6 billion is quoted).*

A reference was provided.

* *Research question: P 2. The (1) must be deleted. Please consider reformulating the section.*

This was done.

* *Literature review third paragraph, third line: a comma must be inserted after Saayman.*

This was done.

* *Figure 1: Extend the vertical arrows to touch the boxes.*

This was corrected.

* *Section 3.2: Please use the most recent data to describe the regions. This data must be of the same year for all the provinces. Contact Quantec Research to obtain data for 2011*.

The latest available data of Census 2011 was incorporated.

* *Section 4.1 second paragraph second paragraph third last row: “…for Limpopo, 110 (n=101)” – please check.*

This was corrected.

* *Section 4.2: Please add a formal reference*.

This was done.

* *Renumber 4.3 to 4.2.1; 4.4 to 4.2.2 and 4.5 to 4.2.3. Do similar adjustments to the rest of section 4.*

This was done.

* *The conclusions based on table 4 are difficult to verify due to the inconsistencies in the table (see above).*

Attention was given to this.

* *I will incorporate section 6 into the conclusion. Last line of section 6 must read “Future …” and not “Feature …”*

Good idea, we made the chances.

* *Inconsistent font use in list of references – see “Noss …”*

This was checked.

All other errors not mentioned by the reviewers were also corrected.

We thank both reviewers for their insightful comments. We hope that our revisions will meet with your approval.

Thank you for your help with our manuscript.

Sincerely,

The Authors