

The paper offers an analysis of residents' perceptions and related acceptance of potential local investment in cruise tourism (infrastructure?).

The paper has a number of problems, some of which have already been pointed out by the first anonymous referee, with whom I agree in particular with regard to points (1) and (2). In addition to taking care of these critiques (the second one is particularly relevant), in order to make their paper acceptable for publication, the authors should take action on the following additional points.

Main Comments

- General point: One question looming over the whole paper is the following: when the authors refer to investment in cruise tourism, what do they refer to exactly? To investment by the local authorities (e.g., the city of Messina) or directly by the residents? In rows 2–3 of p. 7, the phrasing chosen ('... to assess residents' opinion about the degree at which they would invest ...') does not help. In particular, no reference is made to what would the costs of such investment be for the residents, for example in terms of taxes (i.e., no objective scenario is given to the interviewees to evaluate). This is obviously central to the analysis. This concern may be seen as an addition to the first referee's point (2).
- p. 7, end of page: as noted in an online comment to the paper, the description of the expectation for the statistical distribution of the generalized logit's residuals appears to be wrong. Appropriate references should be given or it should be corrected. Also, it may be convenient to explicitly frame the discussion between the standard ordered logit (proportional odds model, for statisticians) and the generalized one in terms of the 'parallelism' assumption.
- p. 10, last row of Section 4: the authors do not explain how they calculate that their sample is representative of the local population at the 1 per cent level. This may be explained in a footnote.
- p. 10, first paragraph of Section 5: again, the meaning of 'support further investment' is unclear. Does this imply a moral/electoral/emotional support or a financial support (directly or, e.g., indirectly through an increase of local taxes)?
- p. 10, same paragraph as above: why does the dependent take numerical values? Ordered logit models are for categorical variables. As such, the dependent should be then coded as a set of indicator variables. Please clarify this.
- p. 11, first full paragraph: what does 'increase in lifestyle' mean? How can a lifestyle 'increase'?
- p. 11, end of page: again, the rejection of the hypothesis of parallelism should be mentioned.
- p. 12, end of first paragraph: the finding that residents who live far from the port are less favourable to investment in cruise tourism seems counter-intuitive. The authors should provide an interpretation for it.
- p. 12, second paragraph: here the problem of the expected effects of investment (instead of proposed scenarios) is very evident.
- p. 13, first phrase of first full paragraph ('In terms of ...'): this phrase is unclear, I cannot understand it.
- p. 14, third row: why should an increase of congestion in public/private areas be desirable for the residents? Similarly, why are women less favourable to investment? The author should provide an interpretation for these findings.
- p. 14, third paragraph: the authors' findings do not suggest, in my view, the need to investigate the residents' opinion, since no information is given on how their support (or lack of it) would influence the local community, local politicians, etc.

Minor Comments

- p. 8, Eq. (3): phi is not defined.
- p. 8, third row from the bottom: unless the authors specify that Stata is being used as a software, how should the reader recognize the 'gologit' command?
- p. 9, Eq. (5): b is not defined.
- p. 10, fifth row: the meaning of ISTAT is not clear to the international audience. Please define it.
- p. 20, Table 2: why only one coefficient is given for the quadratic 'Age' term?