

## **Response to referee #2**

*Thank you for inviting me to review this manuscript. The paper itself is well written, although a) somewhat descriptive. The authors have conducted a thorough literature review, undertaken a rigorous piece of data collection and have analyze information accurately.*

*b) The paper can be accepted as is, with minor grammatical corrections. It is recommended that a native English speaker conduct a minor revision.*

*c) It is also acknowledged that this paper is probably the first of many papers to emerge from the study. As such, it is an overview paper that raises many questions. It would be interesting for the authors to try to segment the visiting population by trip purpose, based on visiting friends and relatives, destination resorts and other types of travel. It would also be interesting to analyze the two subsets of first-time and repeat visitors. It would also be interesting to look at the impact of distance on travel behavior. The authors need to recognize that a trip to Sicily most likely involves a touring holiday. Their research has certainly shown this, as has the tendency of visitors to engage in multidestination travel. What would be most interesting would be to look at the 16% of respondents who visited three or more destinations. They could provide a very useful and interesting subset of respondents.*

*d) The recommendations section can be enhanced. The authors talked about introducing new destinations to attract tourists. This suggestion is a bit naïve. Ultimately, it is an issue of time availability and time budget allocation. New destinations may simply dilute visitation rather than extending the length of stay.*

*It was a pleasure to read this manuscript. I wish the author of the best.*

## **Response to referee #2**

Thanks to the referee for the useful suggestions provided, below the revisions made in the last version, according to referee's comments.

**a)** The strongest lack of the previous paper was related to the absence of statistical test to evaluate the significance of the results. In the last version uploaded, final estimates of the variables of interest were made, more details on the estimator are provided, and comparisons among sub-group estimate are included to be able to evaluate the significance of the results. Now the paper should appear less descriptive.

**b)** Minor grammatical corrections were made and an English native speaker went throughout the paper.

**c)** The referee is right when he states that this is one of the first papers to emerge from the study. As such we prefer to give more details on to the research design and on the estimation procedures rather than on the analysis of potential specific questions. This will be made in future more specific papers, where the literature review and the general content of the paper will be directed to more specific issues.

**d)** The recommendation section was enhanced according to referee's suggestions. More references were provided to support some of the conclusions related with the results of the analysis.