**Decision Support for Foodbank South Africa**

Reviewer feedback: Issues that need attention

(i) The abbreviation FBCT is used towards the end of section 2.1, nowhere in the text is there an indication of what this stands for. The abbreviation is explained in the abstract, but I would suggest it is done in the text as well.

- The abbreviation has already been explained in the text, and not in the abstract. It is explained on page 2 in the last paragraph of section 1.

(ii) In the last sentence of section 2.1 the abbreviation RDs is used – no idea what this is at this point. No explanation given, etc. It is only given in the next section although not very explicitly especially early on. Root definition is in the heading of section 2.2 but then RD is defined without saying that RD is actually Root definition – correct please.

- The definition has already been explained in the abstract. However, it is explained again at its first appearance in the text, on page 5 in the final paragraph of section 2.1, just before the start of section 2.2

(iii) The whole explanation of CATWOE and then PQR is not very clear – please attend to this? I just found it difficult to follow. How does the two relate, why is this given? (I know it is the methodology and it address the various actors/issues but the two things are just not properly explained.)

- The two are separate tools that can both be used to define the purposeful activity system under investigation. They are not directly related. The paragraph has been adjusted slightly to promote clarity around this issue.

(iv) Throughout the paper there is reference to author (the author this, the author that – nothing wrong with this) However the paragraph starting with “After initial meetings held with representatives from FBSA, subsequent meetings with…” the term “practitioner” is used. Is this the author or somebody else? If it is the author why suddenly switch to calling him/her practitioner? Not clear – please attend too this?

- The author was already identified as the practitioner on page 5, section 2.2 in the second bullet point. However, to avoid any confusion, “practitioner” has been replaced by author on page 6 in the final paragraph.

(v) Just a sentence or two further it is stated “.RDs for each of the stakeholders were built..”. I am querying the use of the word “built” – does one not “compile” a definition or “construct”? Maybe I am too pedantic.

- “built” has been changed to “constructed”

(vi) The paragraph starting: “The environmental constraints….” refers. I have a problem with environmental – it has a certain connotation in the way it is commonly used - it has something to do with the environment (trees, bushes, rivers, etc. etc.) Should one not use the term “resource constraints.. to me it seems as if this is what is being referred to.

- The word “environmental” is a direct reference to the ‘CATWOE’ mnemonic. It is defined in Figure 2 on page 6. Changing the word to “resource” would only create more confusion in my opinion. If the reader studies the figure, they should get a good idea of what “environmental” means in this context

(vii) NPO is not defined. (None Profit Organisation??) Please add this.

- “NPO” has been changed to “not-for-profit organization”

(vii) In this same paragraph towards the middle and end of the paragraph there is first reference to
FBCT, in fact, the entire paragraph refers to FBCT and then suddenly there is reference to FBSA. I understand that the intention is that what is being developed for FBCT will be taken over or be used in the rest of FBSA. This whole issue, and here I mean the way this issue, is described needs a careful relook. When I read this piece I was just suddenly confused when FBSA was being mentioned. I’m pointing this out maybe one can relook at the way this is being conveyed.

- The footnote ' ”FBSA” refers to the organization itself, whilst ”FBCT” refers to FBSA's Cape Town warehouse’ has been added to page 1, at the end of the sentence ‘SA’s nationwide foodbanking organization, Foodbank South Africa (FBSA), officially opened for business on 2 March 2009 with the commissioning of the Foodbank Cape Town (FBCT) warehouse in Philippi, just outside Cape Town’ in order to provide clarification between the two.

(viii) Again I have an issue with terminology – the use of the word transformation. The term again has a certain connotation in South Africa and it could be confusing the way it is being used here. What about “change” – it means the same I believe and it cuts out this possible confusion.

- Again, the word “transformation” is a direct reference to the ‘CATWOE’ mnemonic in Figure 2 on page 6. Changing it to “change” will foster confusion. After studying Figure 2 the reader should gain an appreciation of its meaning in this context. However the phrase “or change” has been added directly after “transformation process” in order to provide clarification.

(ix) Line 3 in para starting: We used the above framework…. It says “the support provided to by FBCT” should it not just be “the support provided by FBCT”?
- Noted, and changed accordingly

(x) Next sentence: I propose: The primary intended of the changes are improving the accuracy, efficiency, fairness of the allocation system. (take out the “and” and use changes).

- The sentence has been changed to “The primary intended outcomes of the transformation are improving the \textit{accuracy}, \textit{efficiency} and \textit{fairness} of the allocation system”. The word “transformation” has been retained as explained in (viii) above.

(xi) Little bit further - ..a higher percentage of satisfied needs…. (needs instead of need)
- Has been changed accordingly

(xii) The rest of the paragraph is again a bit confusing; try to make it more cleared.

- The sentence “….changes that reduce resource use whilst either maintaining the of the current allocation system or improving it would be desirable” has been changed to “….changes that reduce the amount of resources used whilst either maintaining the performance of the current allocation system or improving it would be desirable” to promote clarity or purpose.

(xiii) Last sentence of this section - …do this without within their… take out without.
- Noted, and changed accordingly

(xiv) Section 3.1 line 6/7 – two “depicts” almost straight after each other – use show or presents for the second one(?)
- Second “depicts” changed to “shows”

(xv) Section 3.1 2nd para, 2nd line – layer is of„, take out of.
- Noted, and changed accordingly

(xvi) Last sentence before Figure 4: It seems as if a space is required between existing agency.Upon.
- Noted, and changed accordingly
(xvii) Last para of the paper – “They planned… “ surely this should read “They plan…”
- Noted, and changed accordingly

(xviii) Has this now been implemented in FBCT – if it has state it a bit more explicitly and clearly.
- No it has not. “More recent feedback” has been changed to “The most recent feedback” in order to clarify this.