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| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer 1 Comment** | **Authors Response** |
| * As an addition to the discussion -- The communities that chose to emphasize resource development (oil and gas), how are they faring compared to the tourism development communities? Discuss differences/similarities (if possible). | While a comparative analysis of communities that chose to emphasize resource development and those with heritage tourism development initiatives would be interesting and useful, the authors feel it would not fit the scope of this paper or word count; however, two sentences have been added to address the opportunities and challenges presented by resource development in NL on page 5:  “Extractive resource development saw increased oil and gas-related ventures in the province, which were credited with building a ‘new economy’ and transforming NL to a ‘have’ from a ‘have-not’ province (Springuel, 2011). Whether this kind of economic development is sustainable in the long-term has come into question, along with concerns about the concentration of benefits in urban centres (Barber, 2016; Vodden et al., 2014).” |
| * Provide map showing location of places, if possible. Provides better context. Maybe also some photos to help situate the reader? | A map has been added to the “Introduction to Case Studies” section, in addition to photos of each of the three case studies throughout the paper. |
| * Introduce/define the forms of capital much sooner, maybe in the lit review section as part of the introduction to rural community capitals framework. Right now, they are only mentioned (not defined) prior to the analysis/results section. | Natural, human, social and economic capitals are now defined in section 2.3 *Community Assets and Capacities and the Multi-Capital Lens* (page 6). |
| * At times the authors(s) seem to use the terms resilience, sustainability, and development interchangeably – make clear all three terms. This is somewhat introduced in the Literature Review section (which I think deserves a better heading) but only dealt with superficially and does not appear to impact how the discussion occurs later on (you see the words used interchangeably). Look at book “Resilience: Why things bounce back?” (2013) by Zolli and Healy for a good discussion. | The literature review section has been re-named, as suggested. Section 2.1 has been re-named *Rural Community Development, Resilience and Sustainability* and now offers definitions for each of these concepts. We have also rectified the use of these words interchangeably throughout the paper. |
| * When discussing issues of heritage, the word “indigenous” might be confusing if not referring to First Peoples. At the very least, explain use, or use “settler”. I understand what is meant, particularly given it is not capitalized, but it could be confusing/insulting to others. | As recommended, the word ‘indigenous’ has been replaced in the article by the words ‘local’ and/or ‘settler’ depending on the context of the sentences to which they were attached. |
| * I think the volunteerism element of human capital is critical to many of these programs, and might deserve a bit more of a discussion – particularly given the problem of aging demographic of the communities. Check out the many articles in JRCD e.g. Vol 11, No 1 (2016) | The following has been added to the comparative analysis of human capital on page 19: “The significance of a committed volunteer-based, however, is worth re-stating. As demonstrated by Gallo and Duffy (2016), the commitment of long-term volunteerism, in addition to the acquiring sustainable funding, may contribute positively to the sustaining and/or advancement of an organization.” The Gallo and Duffy (2016) article, as recommended, comes from JRCD e.g. Vol 11, No 1 (2016). |
| * Minor grammar issues, missing/wrong words, etc. (requires editing).   + E.g. p.17: Economic capital is divided into financial capital (liquid assets) and physical capital (liquid assets) according to Beckley et al. (2008). | The highlighted grammatical error has been corrected and the authors have corrected additional grammatical errors throughout. |
| **Reviewer 2 Comment** | **Authors Response** |
| The aim of the research as outlined on page 2 is to assess the contribution of a number of local initiatives to the sustainability and resilience of local communities. The discussion does a good job at describing the contribution but to my mind does not appear to have shown how they have increased sustainability or resilience. How can increased sustainability or resilience be demonstrated? One way might be a decline in out migration, others might be increase in local businesses, increasing tourism numbers, new tourism related businesses, falling unemployment etc. This issue needs to be addressed. | It is true that this paper does not discuss how the three initiatives in question have increased the overall sustainability and/or resilience of the communities in which they exist. The objective of the project was to assess the contributions of each initiative towards sustainability and resilience rather than quantify end outcomes of this kind. This paper represents a modest form of participatory action research (rather than a more comprehensive investigation). The authors do not feel, therefore, that they are able to comment on how each initiative has *increased* sustainability and resilience. This is also a function of the complex nature of the context under review and the limitations of available evaluation techniques. We have therefore added the following to limitations of the study:  “Finally, a challenge associated with outcome-based evaluation is the attribution of effects to particular activities. This is especially difficult in complex systems with multiple factors contributing to a given outcome or situation, as in the case of rural communities and regions of NL. In such circumstances it is important to take into account immediate and intermediate outcomes that can be expected to contribute to ultimate desired outcomes according to a theory of change (Mayne, 2008). This article therefore draws from Beckley et al.’s (2008) community capacity model, which suggests that multiple forms of capital, paired with capacity catalysts and social relations are likely to lead to final capacity outcomes. Contributions to these multiple capitals and relationships are considered.”  The following has also been added to the community and regional development implications section on page 24, tying back to the definition of resilience offered on page 4:  “Each of the initiatives has also contributed to the resilience of their local communities by providing economic opportunities, fostering collaboration among local organizations, and developing local capacity via training and skills development and the transmission of local knowledge and/or practices. Such efforts may contribute to the ability of their localities to adapt to future economic and/or cultural change.” |
| It would be useful to include supporting references for *out-comes based evaluation* and *multiple capitals framework* discussed in the first paragraph on page 2. | The following article has been cited for both approaches: Harger-Forde, S. Commissioned by Community Waitakere. (2012). “1) Literature Review of Evaluation Methods & Methodologies”. *Community Development Evaluation Research*. 1-43.  Beckley et al. (2008), a key article used in framing the multiple capitals approach is also cited. |
| There are a number of quotes that do not include page numbers. | Page numbers have been added to citations referencing quoted text in this paper. |
| It would be useful to include a sentence or two to outline why the cod industry collapsed, some readers may be unaware of the implications of the closure. | In section 2.2 *The Role of Heritage in Community Development and Sustainability*, the following has been added:  “The 1990s were marked by a crisis in the fishing industry in NL. Multiple factors, particularly decades of overfishing by foreign trawlers led to the depletion of Northern Cod stocks (Overton, 2007; Kendall, 2005) and a moratorium on the province’s cod fishery that shattered the economic base of many rural and fisheries-dependent communities (Overton, 2007).” |
| A map would be useful. | A map has been added to the “Introduction to Case Studies” section, in addition to photos of each of the three case studies throughout the paper. |
| Some idea of the scale of tourism in the provinces and if possible in the case study towns would be useful. | The following has been added on page 6 to address this suggestion:  “Illustrating the success of these efforts, in 2015, NL saw 503,000 non-resident visitors to the province, an increase from 263,000 in 1991 (pre cod moratorium). These visitors spent $492.8 million, up from an estimated $117.5 million over the same period (Department of Business, Tourism, Culture and Rural Development, 2015; NL, 1992). In 2015, approximately 24,000 visitors made their way to L’Anse Aux Meadows National Historic Site at the top of the Northern Peninsula, a 15% increase from 2014 (Department of Business, Tourism, Culture and Rural Development, 2015).”  In addition, visitor numbers for GHP and TRSEP have been added to the discussion of economic capitals on page 21: “Each of the initiatives has also been successful in drawing tourists to their locals. For instance, GHP saw 17,500 paying and non-paying customers in 2016, while TRSEP saw 2800 visitors and more than 27 tour buses in 2015 (personal communication, April 24, 2017; personal communication, October 22, 2015).” |
| It would be worth including tourism as a key word | Tourism has been added as a keyword. |
| The conclusion should demonstrate how the findings have contributed to knowledge. For example, can the methodological approach be replicated elsewhere? Is Beckley et al’s framework suitable or does it need modification? Do the findings support previous research that was mentioned in the literature review? | A discussion of the suitability of the multiple-capitals framework offered by Beckley et al. (2008) is offered in the conclusion and recommendations section (p. 25).  “This framework was found to be suitable for comparative analysis in the context of this paper; however, the authors find that mobilization of resources in particular capital categories, focusing on building on respective strengths, may be more effective than mobilizing resources in all capital categories. At the same time, the framework ensures that contributions in other areas are considered as well.” |