1. Both models consider a finite large scale cut-off, but as the authors state there is a difference on the interpretation it is given to this cut-off. In one case, the cut-off corresponds to the mean free path, so that the forager find a target within that distance. In the other case, the cut-off is much smaller than the mean free path, thus corresponding to "obstacles" (energy, enemies, etc) within that range. However, formally, both the truncated and the tempered models consider the cut-off as a main concept. I must then insist on that this point should be clear for the reader: a comparison between the models and a clear discussion must be included either in the Introduction section or with the basic definitions of the tempered model. This discussion should include the answers the authors gave to questions 1.a), 1.b) and 1.c).

2. The authors questioned the validity of the expressions used by Viswanathan et al. (1999) for the mean flight numbers for the present case and propose to use instead another estimation, given by Eqs. (5) and (8). I accept this idea. However, I am still not convinced of the validity of these estimations. Is it possible to compute the mean flight numbers using the numerical simulations? According to numerical simulations, are these approximate expressions a good estimate for the mean flight numbers?

3. Therefore, if the truncation almost has no influence on the results and both approximations give essentially the same results, this should be commented/discussed in the text. This would help the reader to understand why two different approximations are used within the same context. Please modify the manuscript accordingly.

7. I Understand that the Lévy Flight (mu=0) has a long tail compared with the tempered case. My point is that a short comment should be included in the manuscript: Something like "please note that we have included the $\mu = 0$ case in order to emphasize the fact that the tempered Lévy distribution always has a shorter tail than the pure $\mu = 0$ Lévy distribution" would help with the reading of the manuscript.

15. I understand that in theory, and due to the Central Limit Theorem, the foraging procedure should tend to Brownian motion. My question is how close the numerical results are to Brownian behavior? Have the authors measure the mean square displacement of the forager?