

Response to Reviewer 3

Dear Editors and Reviewers,

Please find below our response to **Reviewer's 3** comments. Changes are shown with **Track Changes** in the word document of the manuscript. Line numbers below refer to **Simple Markup**.

This study presents an interesting and original analysis of the predictive ability of WVOs and has the potential to provide useful background information to wildlife managers and decision makers.

The aims and objectives are clearly defined and overall the paper is well written. The data are well analysed, statistical analysis is straightforward and conclusions drawn reflect the findings. Therefore I believe this paper will make a good contribution to the journal.

I believe the manuscript needs minor revision and I would like to make few recommendations to the author(s) in order to improve this paper:

Methods

Section 2.1. Sampling protocol and sample size

Line 153-154: I am surprised that the sampling method that was employed (every fifth person passing in front of the researcher), which has a significant element of randomness (systematic random sample), has provided such an accurate representation of the gender, age, educational level and urban/rural structure of the overall Greek population. Unfortunately, not enough information is provided in the paper as the authors simply cite the work of Liordos et al. I would very much like to see specific numbers regarding gender, age, educational level and urban/rural structure and how these are compared to national distribution. Alternatively, the authors should remove the sample was not different to that of the population's

---Response to Reviewer's#3 comment: This an issue with on-site surveys. We try to solve this by increasing our sample size. We added the suggested comparisons in lines 146-155.

Section 2.2. Survey design

Line 160: It is not clear why the authors are using a reference at the end of the sentence. DO they imply that they have used the same WVOs and statements as Jacobs et al 2014? If yes, then it should be stated clearly

---Response to Reviewer's#3 comment: Yes, we followed Jacobs et al. (2014). We clarified this. See line 160.

Lines 159-162: Please indicate that the statements are available in Tables to follow. It would be appropriate to present the statements. The nature of the statement may affect the people's

response. At the moment the reviewer cannot judge the appropriateness and the potential implications of the statements.

---Response to Reviewer's#3 comment: We added this indication in lines 160-161.