

STAKEHOLDER REVIEW					
CHAPTER 4		Ethical considerations in the management of livestock predator impacts			
Stakeholder Name	Page/s	Line/s	Table/Figure	Stakeholder Comment	Author Response
Quinette Kruger	6-7	179-230		It may be useful to also include moral obligations to future generations in terms of agricultural practices. Besides for preserving biodiversity and natural environments that contain predators that are aesthetically pleasing, another moral obligation may be to prevent veld degradation. According to Lensing & Joubert (1976), the near extermination of predators from the mountainous parts of sheep farming regions caused an increase in hyrax populations. When hyrax compete with sheep flocks for grazing during the dry season, veld is damaged (also negatively impacting species diversity and composition of plants). Restoring veld condition may take decades, which in some cases, will affect future generations. Unfortunately, I was not able to find the specific publications referring to veld degradation and restoration due to time constraints. Hoffman & Todd's publications on land degradation may, however, point the authors in the right direction for reference.	Added veld degradation to list of examples of these issues.
Quinette Kruger	12	371		animals rightists should be animal rightists	Corrected
Quinette Kruger	23	788-790		Suggestion: change sentence to read: "One of the responsibilities of the State in this situation may well be to set up programmes to conscientise livestock owners in an attempt encourage a 'culture of co-existence'."	Amended accordingly
Quinette Kruger	25	860		should be: "...action out of a number..."	Corrected
Quinette Kruger	26	894		Should be: "If resources are to be expended, this needs to be..."	Corrected
Quinette Kruger	29	995		Remove "the" to read: "...continue to have to shoulder..."	corrected
Quinette Kruger	General comment+B5:E11			Throughout the chapter, "et al." should be in italics	Corrected
Gail Potgieter	34-35	1181-1184		This is a misquote of Potgieter et al. (2016) - the dogs were not found to be killing livestock, but to be killing predators - mainly black-backed jackals. When we combined reported killings of jackals by dogs and farmers, more jackals were killed after dog introduction than before. A similar trend (not significant) was found for caracals. A few dogs also killed non-target species (e.g. carnivores that do not prey on livestock, like African wildcats; game species that are prey animals, like young kudu). We did not report that "the sheepdogs themselves were responsible for killing livestock". Lastly, update the citation for this work to: Potgieter et al. (2016), it was published online in 2015, but in hardcopy in 2016.	Changed to: "Potgieter et al also discovered that the sheepdogs themselves were responsible for killing predators, including non-target species"
Gail Potgieter	31-32	1080-1089		Calling into question the very existence of livestock farming, before looking at ethical issues surrounding predation specifically, is not helpful. Previously in the chapter, the authors rightly show that there are many people who have an important stake in the livestock farming industry (p. 5, lines 148-150); i.e. farmers and surrounding communities. Yet in this Box, the comment I refer to focuses solely on the interests of one set of stakeholders (consumers and environmentalists), whilst ignoring the other set - farmers and farming communities. This sets a tone for the Box by suggesting upfront that the author considers the livestock industry itself to be questionable. In particular, in lines 1082-1084, the author seems to assume that one could commercially produce 'alternative food' to animals on current livestock farms (i.e. crops). Most of the land under livestock in SA, particularly the sheep farms of the Cape, is used for that purpose because it is too arid to grow crops in these areas. Consequently, suggesting that one switches entirely to crop production instead of livestock production is to suggest that much of the land in the Cape provinces should not be farmed at all. This would have dire consequences for the farmers and farming communities that depend on them. As the author points out, the ideas presented in these lines are not discussed in detail in the Box, and I therefore suggest that they be removed altogether.	Removed the whole section.
John Power	1	14-16		Reference?	I could not find anything at these lines needing a reference.
John Power	2	35		mesopredators - just predators?	Changed to predators
John Power	2	37		Reference?	Common knowledge
John Power	4	131		Hobbes reference?	Reference at line 137 to Friend n.d. is the reference for all of the discussion of Hobbes preceding it.
John Power	5	152		Some of these stakeholders are not even on the same continent!	Noted
John Power	5	156		et al. ? Not sure conventions here?	Conventions differ. Another reviewer asked for italics, and all have been updated accordingly.
John Power	6	186		scientific names for these species	This is an ethics chapter, common names will do. I will include species names if requested by the editors.
John Power	6	194		Reference?	It is a logical inference, not based on particular empirical studies
John Power	7	211		Bujo 1998, Murove 2004) - convention like this?	Unsure of convention. Will leave it to discretion of proof editor.
John Power	7	212		John O'Neil (1993):	Full reference is provided at the end of the quote, line 227, as per standard convention in my field
John Power	9	276-277		FYI - even Nazi Germany in 1930s had passed animal-cruelty laws, desite their appalling human rights policies. Not sure if applicable.	Noted
John Power	10	306		deontological - simpler word?	It is the standard term used for all duty-based theories of right action
John Power	10	311		..., similarly, not capitaled	Corrected, by changing preceding comma to full stop
John Power	11	345		Reference?	Again, the reference is at line 330 at the end of the whole section on Regn's view.
John Power	12	376-380		Good point, maybe reference needed?	I do not have sight of the version used by reviewer. My loine references inserted in Word are out of synch, so I am unable to find the exact references without further infomation.
John Power	13	410-411		Reference?	As above
John Power	13	428		Apis mellifera honey bee	I will include species names if requested by the editors.
John Power	13	437		Can you not just say (see Callicott 1986)?	No. Callicott's work in developing the ideas of Leopold is very important and deserves mentioning specifically
John Power	14	470		References - (xxxxx, xxxx) - convention?	I will follow whatever convention is agreed to.
John Power	16	535		Hybrid	Corrected,
John Power	16	545		positions	Corrected
John Power	17	554		Light 2004? Year date.	Corrected
John Power	17	577		delete territories	Corrected
John Power	17	579		where the incentive was to kill them	I don't understand comment
John Power	17	580		scientific names except last 2 species	I will include species names if requested by the editors.
John Power	17	584		Reference?	References for this section follow at line 589
John Power	18	588		repetition of line 585.	Corrected
John Power	18	589		References - (xxxxx, xxxx) - convention?	I will follow whatever convention is agreed to.
John Power	19	627-628		rephrase ? Left to landowners to..	Corrected
John Power	19	637		predators	Corrected
John Power	19	655		Later chapters to delve.	Don't understand comment
John Power	20	667		(Chapter 2)	Don't understand comment
John Power	20	672		possible to ignore	corrected
John Power	20	693		North West Province can only assist with TOPS listed high-profile animals, ie leopard, brown hyaena which are relocated frequently, while landowners have responsibility for jackals where they are in control of them on their properties. FYI.	Noted
John Power	21	701-702		Lethal if restrained animal is shot, but can be removed too non-lethally	Noted
John Power	22	747		Dubois et al. 2017?? Conventions?	Convention will need to be decided by editors
John Power	23	783		full stop close in to brackets.	Corrected
John Power	24	811		Reference?	Reference for this section comes at line 815

John Power	24	835-837		Reference?	Reference for this section comes at line 839
John Power	25	842		Reference? Heard, H. W. & Stephenson, A. 1987. Electrification of a fence to control the movements of black-backed jackals. S. Afr. J. Wildl. Res. 17(1): 20 - 24.	Added ref.
John Power	25	853		Rephrase - grazing conditioning?	Corrected
John Power	26	880		References - (Bergman etcxxxx, xxxx) - convention?	I will follow whatever convention is agreed to.
John Power	26	894		expended/ or to be expended	corrected
John Power	26	894		to be morally..	Corrected
John Power	26	896-897		Disagree that it is ethically unjustifiable - humans are fallible and can mistakes with resources, including doing wasted studies - even if partly so ? - the rest below agreeable.	Changed to "ethically questionable"
John Power	26	905		True all this ! One thing FYI, there is also a contention of ethics in the actual production of scientific evidence, generally authorities are less trusting of this, if its not unbiased, ie. if agric industry, or hunting organisations fund something, to the other extreme of an Animal rightist group doing likewise - practitioners are circumspect - ethics can also be woven into here somehow ? Just an opinion.	Noted
John Power	27	931		Dubois et al. 2017?? Conventions?	I will follow whatever convention is agreed to.
John Power	27	942		References (xxxx, xxxx) ?	I will follow whatever convention is agreed to.
John Power	28	958		, where each method would have different outcomes, fencing and kraaling the most serious etc & poisons into water etc - maybe some egs.	I don't understand comment.
John Power	29	990		Social media has become a powerful platform to air dubious activities etc	Noted
John Power	29	995		to have to shoulder..	Changed to "continue to shoulder"
John Power	30	1032		delete of.	Corrected,
John Power	31	1045		This whole section is long for a little box ? There is also a lot covered in other sections, am sure it can be shortened, and focussed on the topic - which is good, but maybe refer to other chapters so not the same info repeated again and again.. ?	This is a decision that needs to be made by the editors.
John Power	General Comment			I think authors must consult and try weave in the Animal Protection Act - 1962 a bit somewhere at least, as ethics is engrained in it a bit, maybe its outdated ?	There is a law chapter. We have tried to focus strictly on ethics