Response to Reviewers: Recreational visits to marine and coastal environments in England: Where, what, who, why, and when?

Dear Emma and Tim,

We thank you and the reviewers for careful consideration of this paper and for the insightful comments the reviewers made which we believe improve the manuscript greatly. We provide responses to each comment made by the reviewers in italicised blue typeface on the pages below. All co-authors have commented on, read, and approved this revised manuscript.

We look forward to your response to this resubmission in due course.

Yours sincerely,

Lewis Elliott

Dear Lewis,

Many thanks for your submission titled “*Recreational visits to marine and coastal environments in England: Where, what, who, why, and when?”* to the special issue of Marine Policy. We now have the comments from two reviewers which are provided below.

Both Reviewers 1 and 2 have recommended the paper should be accepted subject to minor corrections; both editors have also read the paper, agree with the comments from the reviewers and feel that this is an interesting and topical paper that will sit well within the planned special issue.

We would like to accept the article subject to minor changes. Please consider the comments from both reviewers have said and either modify your text appropriately, or, where you chose not to, explain to the editors why you have decided not make alterations in certain sections.

Can you ensure that your resubmitted article adheres to the Marine Policy Guide for authors <https://www.elsevier.com/journals/marine-policy/0308-597x/guide-for-authors> for instance ensuring that reference styles are correct.

Please confirm if you are happy to submit a revised manuscript by Friday 10th November.  If you would like to submit a revision, we would need to have your revised text by Friday 15th December.

**Reviewer 1**

Recreational visits to marine and coastal environments in England: Where, what, who, why and when?

Overall, this paper should be accepted for publication in the special issue.  It presents a topical and much needed addition to the literature and provides a good baseline picture for future studies to develop further on.  Additionally, the paper has direct policy implications and can be used by academics, students and importantly planners and managers drivign forward the 'blue growth' agenda.

I felt the paper was well written and structured throughout.  It also has a breadth of supporting references useful to augment its findings.

The statistical analysis, whilst fairly descriptive was sufficient and appropriate to this paper.

*We thank the Reviewer for their positive assessment of this paper.*

Only very minor additions:

Reference early on and thence throughout to British Marine statistics could have been used as well - as altough primarily 'boating related' - these are a n industry benchmark.

*In response to Reviewer comments, we now refer to British Marine Federation's 2015 report on water sports participation statistics in the first paragraph of the Introduction:*

*"An estimated 12.4 million people participated at least once in marine and coastal recreation in the UK in 2015 []"*

*While we cannot directly compare these estimated frequencies with ours (as we examined numbers of visits rather than numbers of people), we now refer to the same statistics in our discussion of walking in Section 4.1 to contextualise (approximately) the frequency with which an individual might visit the coast for the purpose of recreational walking.*

More care could have been taken differentiating between coastal and marine in places eg line 214 / 224 / 292

*We thank the Reviewer for their attention to detail. In response to Reviewer comments, the mention of marine at line 214 has been changed to "coastal" as the activities clearly pertain to on-land recreation; and the instance at line 292 has been changed to "marine and coastal" as we cannot deduce precisely where swimming took place. Line 224 correctly mentions "coastal." In general, it is clear that "beaches" and "other coastline" categories ostensibly refer to coastal rather than marine environments; and we have tried to be more mindful of this terminology throughout. At the same time, we continue the discussion of marine recreation where it is applicable; and maintain the implications of the findings to marine policy.*

Otherwise, I enjoyed this paper and would support its acceptance with these very minor adjustments.

**Reviewer 2**

I am happy to recommend this paper for publication in the Special Issue of Marine Policy with a few minor amendments. However, please note that neither the Supplementary Table A or Figures 1 and 2 were available in the downloaded document and so I have been unable to comment on them.

I am unsure what is contained in the Supplementary Table A so this comment may not apply. On page 5, line 110 the authors mention a list of 20 activities. As I do not see the entire list anywhere it would be useful if the authors produced an Appendix with the entire list. This also applies to page 6, line 137 where the authors mention 14 reasons for their visit. It would be useful to see the list of 14 reasons also included somewhere such as an Appendix to the paper.

*A list of nineteen activities is indeed present in Supplementary Table A and the twentieth refers to an "any other outdoor activity" option which was omitted from analysis as it was deemed unhelpful to marine planners (this option is only chosen by respondents for comparatively very small numbers of visits anyway). In response to Reviewer comments, this point has been added to the footnote of Supplementary Table A.*

*Conversely, only the main "health," "relaxation," and "social" motivation categories are present in the tables and supplementary files. We feel it would be too lengthy to include all fourteen in a table footnote; but as these are included in MENE's technical report along with their exact wording, we have instead provided a reference (with web link) to the technical report of MENE in the article where the list of fourteen is mentioned. We hope this is an acceptable compromise.*

Some of the grammar and tenses in the paper appear to be incorrect or unclear and I would suggest the author(s) use a grammar checker to make sure that these are correct and make sense. NOTE - I have gone through the first 12 pages and made suggestions in the table below but have not done so for the rest of the paper as it is a time-consuming process.

Standard nomenclature in the UK is “socio-economic classifications” – NOT grades, e.g. lines 17, 18,122, 126 etc. etc. I suggest the authors use “classifications” throughout.

Specific comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Page and line | Comment |
| 1, 11 | Suggest saying “regional factors best predict them” |
| 1, 13-14 | Change “although the majority involve” to “with the majority involving” |
| 1, 16 | Change “equally like” to “equally alike” |
| 2, 33-35 | More recently than what? Suggest changing to start sentence with “A 2012 valuation …” then end the sentence with “… in that year” |
| 2, 43 | Change “to create” to “of creating” |
| 2, 45-46 | I suggest you say “… describes the UK government’s vision as “a healthy natural environment ….” Currently you have natural environment appearing twice on the same line and this repetition should be avoided |
| 3, 51-52 | You say that there is little published evidence and this seems rather definitive. Might read better as “There appears to be little …. however”. |
| 3, 62 | Would read better as “The study presented in this paper was …. It used seven years of data …” |
| 3, 70 | Suggest using “can predict” instead of “predicted” |
| 5, 101-103 | Could you please identify what the different environments were for a, b and c on these three lines |
| 5, 106 | What do you mean by “and so forth” – could either use etc. or improve wording here |
| 6, 133 | After occupations I would suggest you add a semi-colon and then add the words “this classification also includes state pensioners ….” |
| 7, 158 | You use the word “eudaimonic” and while it might be familiar to some readers it will not necessarily be for all – perhaps you could add a brief definition |
| 8, 169-174 | You discuss “odds” here for (a), (b) and (c). As this refers to odds ratios it might be better if you write that in full at (a) and then use OR for subsequent uses |
| 8, 175 | It is unclear whether you mean all 35-64 year olds (M&F) the way this sentence is written. Also, do you mean females of all ages? Could make this clearer |
| 8, 175-176 | Omit “most” or “highest” as both are not necessary – they are either the most frequent or highest frequency, not both |
| 8, 183 | Not all readers will be familiar with R so it would be useful to briefly explain |
| 9, 187 | Suggest changing sentence to read “In total, it is estimated that …..” |
| 9, 194 | Suggest changing sentence to read “An estimated 99.3 million …” |
| 9, 200 | Change “conducted” to “undertaken” |
| 11, 233 | Change to “… than for any other reason” |
| 11, 234 | Change to “… were visited more often at weekends” … “in warmer rather than cooler seasons” |
| 11, 235-236 | Change to “… (as compared to London), and in particular ….” |
| 11, 237 | Could you provide an example of the environments (e.g. …..) |
| 12, 255 | Omit “were” in sentence “South West regions ….” |
| 12, 261 | You say “in most latter survey years”. Should this read “later” |

*We thank the Reviewer for their attention to detail. In response to Reviewer comments, we have omitted all mention of socioeconomic "grade" and have instead used "classification(s)" as suggested. We have additionally made all the suggested changes in the table above, and have been vigilant in grammar- and spell-checking the rest of the article.*

*Regarding the third entry in the above table, the word "like" was a typo, which should have read "likely" and has now been amended.*

*Regarding the tenth entry, we are not entirely certain what the Reviewer expects, but have assumed that they have mistakenly thought that the five environments listed were more specific locations, rather than general categorisations that people could choose from. We have thus referred to them as “categories” rather than “locations” in the section 2.2.1 to hopefully allay this concern.*

The Tables would benefit from the most significant results being highlighted, e.g. use grey background or put results in bold. This would enable to reader to see, at a glance, what are the most significant OR’s

*In response to Reviewer comments, we have added asterisks to odds ratios in tables 1 to 3 denoting .05, .01, and .001 alpha levels. We hope this helps the reader identify more and less significant odds ratios.*