|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer 1 |  |
| Page 2, line 40-43. Sentence confusing. Reword. | The sentence was changed. |
| Page 2, line 45. I am not sure I agree with you that Barcelona is an "emerging tourist destination." You would need to provide some data over the last 10-20 years of visitor numbers to substantiate this claim. Having the one figure from 2016 says very little as there is no reference with which to compare it. | A new paragraph has been added with figures on the evolution of numbers in hotel, as well as in the different motivations of tourists’ to visit the destination. |
| Page 2, line 58. Remove "they." | Removed. |
| Page 3, line 44. Use a more academic reference to make your point in defining "attitude," not a dictionary. | A more academic reference was made on attitude and perception. |
| Page 3, line 50. Change word, "chapter" with something else. You are not writing a thesis or dissertation here. | The word was changed. |
| Page 3, lines 50-52. Be careful here. Attitudes and perceptions are similar but not the same thing and should not be treated as synonymous concepts. | We acknowledge once again the difference between the two terms. After have read the papers on the literature review, we realize that the results were referring to perceptions and not attitudes in terms of actions, which is why insist on the first term (clarifying that we are analyzing in the literature review articles that refer to residents` reactions towards tourism). |
| Page 5. Line 54. Insert reference by Woosnam, et al (2018) that concerns experience use history in addition to the Draper et al. (2011) reference listed. The full reference is:  Woosnam, K.M., Draper, J., Jiang, J., Aleshinloye, K.D., & Erul, E. (2018). Applying self-perception theory to explain residents’ attitudes about tourism development through travel histories. Tourism Management, 64, 357-368. | The new reference was added. We would like to thank the reviewer for bringing this article to our attention. |
| Page 9, Line 42. What criteria did you use in considering an article/piece of writing worthy of inclusion as part of your data? | The criteria were including articles that made reference to tourism issues from the resident’s perspective. We have mentioned that in the paper. |
| Page 10. Lines 24-37. Can you provide a bit of detail on the process you took in analyzing the qualitative data? | We provide a thorough description of how we analyzed the data in the following paragraph. Lines 24-37 explain the theoretical validity of this way of data analysis. We do not know what exact detail reviewers wish to see. We do realize that we have already highly extended the word limitation that our paper can have. |
| Page 19. Line 30. I would refer to section 4 as your "Findings" and section 5 to your "Conclusion/Discussion." | The change has been made. |
| Page 21. Lines 24-28. Confusing sentence; reword. | We have re-phrased the sentence. |
| Page 22, line 22. Change "journals" to "magazines" or some other comparable word so as not to confuse this with academic journals. | We changed to magazines. |
| Page 22, line 28. Change "and avoid generalizations" to "do not focus on making  generalizations." | The change was made. |
| Page 22, line 39. Remove "a" at end of the line. | “a” was removed. |
| Reviewer 2 |  |
| The introduction ends very 'suddenly'; what is the contribution? | We have added a new sentence addressing the main contribution of the paper. |
| Also the statement: "haters are transformed into different types of lovers" is not very clear. | We deleted this sentence. We believe it is not necessary with the new sentence added (see previous comment) |
| End of p.3: perceptions towards. ??? | The sentence has been amended: ‘(…) different types of perceptions towards tourism.’ |
| Authors need to take a more critical approach in the discussion of the models on p.4 | We have added a more critical approach to the models mentioned on page 4. |
| likewise, in section 2.2 you mention four theories SET, CHT, EUH and SRT but I am not quite sure which one you apply and why at the end. | We have explained which theory we use and why at the end of the chapter. |
| p.7 "Nonetheless, .... the locals" not clear argument, please revise | We have revised this sentence. |
| p.8 underdeveloped??  so how does your study add to that? | Sentence has been changed into: ‘It is important to state that the specific perception of DMOs towards tourism has been less developed by researchers to the moment.’ It is true that there are some few previous researches concerning DMO to some extent. However, our study moves forward in the knowledge of DMO’s, mainly in two directions: the creation of perceptions as an evolutionary process, and the comparison in the different evolutionary processes that take place both in DMO’s and among residents’ collectives. |
| p.9 residents's : please correct | We have corrected it. |
| p.21 "simple admission of part...from" please revise | We have revised the phrase. |
| p.22 did you investigate the profiles? | We refer to the phobics and philics as presented in the cluster analysis (lovers and haters) we show in the introduction. In order to avoid misunderstanding we changes to phobics and philics. |
| p.22 last paragraph, i disagree that "...it is supported by those that firstly  attacked" | We suggest here that in a future investigation maybe it could be proven that phobics could end up in time and under particular situations supporting tourism. It does not come from our results. We have made that statement more clearly in that sense. |
| Also, the last recommendation does not offer anything new. | We deleted the last sentence of the last paragraph of the conclusions. |
| Overall, you need to proof-read your work. | We have sent the paper for proof-reading. |
| Reviewer 4 |  |
| think the topic and the paper is appropriate for a research note contribution. I have two main concerns. One is the length of the paper. It is too long for a research note. It should be condensed into a more concise paper. | Thank you very much for the comment. We will explain why we consider this paper is not a research note. We argue that this study is a full academic paper, not a research note or a discussion note. We do not advance a new idea, or a new theoretical framework, nor do we use a new methodology or source of data. It is a qualitative investigation which explains the length of the paper, considering that in previous reviews of this journal, more information was asked to be added. We fear that condensing the content of the paper into a research note means that some of the issues raised (many of which sound interesting, according to our vision and that of the rest of the reviewers) could not be included.  The objective is analyzing through online publications how the public positioning of the perceptions of the residents and the DMO in Barcelona changes in the course of time. We do not consider that we are creating new knowledge in the field of organization studies, so as to speak about a research note. If we had contributed with new knowledge on the field, then we would agree on publishing the research as a research note. |
| The second concern is related to the methodology. It is confusing. Why only one magazine was examined. How did you select the reports? What was the criteria? | In the methodology and previous reviews we have explained that the purpose of this methodology was to represent the projected argumentation of residents and DMOs on a public sphere through the official channels they have created, that is, Carrer and  Turisme de Barcelona. These are the only sources that go back in 2004 and allow an analysis in time. They represent the public space where they are free to publish their opinions.  We have not chosen one of the many sources of official public discourse, but the only one for each side. A public published discourse is secondary data that everyone can have access to and can influence public opinion. In order to present the evolution, we chose to analyze all numbers of these magazines between 2004-2015, having longitudinal data,  as done in other studies. Having seen that methodology applied in longitudinal studies, we have followed the same baseline. That is explained in the paper. |
| Also, its is hard to understand some parts of the paper. It looks like different parts were written by different authors. This paper is in need of editing. Please get the paper professional edited. | We have sent the paper for proof-reading. |