

The *South African Journal of Science* follows a double-anonymous peer review model but encourages Reviewers and Authors to publish their anonymised review reports and response letters, respectively, as supplementary files after manuscript review and acceptance. For more information, see [Publishing peer review reports](#).

### Peer review history for:

Tawane M, Kgotleng DW, Baven B. The children of Taung: Journeying from a rural village to the global stage: The perception of the local community and views regarding the development of the site and the curation of the skull. *S Afr J Sci.* 2025;121(1/2), Art. #18612. <https://doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2025/18612>

#### HOW TO CITE:

The children of Taung: Journeying from a rural village to the global stage: The perception of the local community and views regarding the development of the site and the curation of the skull [peer review history]. *S Afr J Sci.* 2025;121(1/2), Art. #18612. <https://doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2025/18612/peerreview>

#### Reviewer 1: Round 1

**Date completed:** 14 August 2024

**Recommendation:** **Accept** / Revisions required / Resubmit for review / Resubmit elsewhere / Decline / See comments

**Conflicts of interest:** None

Does the manuscript fall within the scope of SAJS?

**Yes/No**

Is the manuscript written in a style suitable for a non-specialist and is it of wider interest than to specialists alone?

**Yes/No**

Does the manuscript contain sufficient novel and significant information to justify publication?

**Yes/No**

Do the Title and Abstract clearly and accurately reflect the content of the manuscript?

**Yes/No**

Is the research problem significant and concisely stated?

**Yes/No**

Are the methods described comprehensively?

**Yes/No**

Is the statistical treatment appropriate?

**Yes/No/Not applicable/Not qualified to judge**

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the research results?

**Yes/Partly/No**

Please rate the manuscript on overall contribution to the field

**Excellent/Good/Average/Below average/Poor**

Please rate the manuscript on language, grammar and tone

**Excellent/Good/Average/Below average/Poor**

Is the manuscript succinct and free of repetition and redundancies?

**Yes/No**

Are the results and discussion confined to relevance to the objective(s)?

**Yes/No**

The number of tables in the manuscript is

**Too few/Adequate/Too many/Not applicable**

The number of figures in the manuscript is

**Too few/Adequate/Too many/Not applicable**

Is the supplementary material relevant and separated appropriately from the main document?

**Yes/No/Not applicable**

Please rate the manuscript on overall quality  
**Excellent/Good/Average/Below average/Poor**

Is appropriate and adequate reference made to other work in the field?  
**Yes/No**

Is it stated that ethical approval was granted by an institutional ethics committee for studies involving human subjects and non-human vertebrates?  
**Yes/No/Not applicable**

If accepted, would you recommend that the article receives priority publication?  
**Yes/No**

Are you willing to review a revision of this manuscript?  
**Yes/No**

Select a recommendation:  
**Accept / Revisions required / Resubmit for review / Decline**

With regard to our policy on '[Publishing peer review reports](#)', do you give us permission to publish your anonymised peer review report alongside the authors' response, as a supplementary file to the published article? Publication is voluntary and only with permission from both yourself and the author.  
**Yes/No**

**Comments to the Author:**

It was well thought out and articulated by highlighting the major gap of stakeholder engagement when it comes the discovery of the Taung skull in Taung. Currently, stakeholder engagement has become part and parcel of heritage resources management in South Africa as stipulated in the National Heritage Resources Act of 1999 no.25.Hence, Archaeology and Palaeosciences as disciplines still need to address contestations surrounding the way they engage especially with communities about heritage moving forward. The paper is a step in the write direction especially for the people of Taung.

Additional comments:

Community participation and participation are an essential issue in heritage management in sites of cultural significance. People-centred approaches to heritage management are key to the long-term sustainability of the site from the local level. The article was able to highlight the need for community participation and participation. Therefore, to move forward, the community must also play a role as custodians in the management of the Taung site, which can also feed directly or indirectly the local economy through heritage tourism to alleviate poverty and youth unemployment. Currently, the site is an untapped resource where the community does not understand the cultural significance of the site that needs to be changed. This is problematic in terms of the DSAC North West, DSAC National , SAHRA and Wits not engaging enough with the local communities, the paper needs to emphasise more on that. For example, the DSAC NW department does not have a fully functioning provincial heritage authority(PHRA) that should work together with the local community including them in the development, management and the paleo-sciences research taking place on the site. The paper does advocate for better community involvement; however, it should factor in the impact of heritage education can play especially for the people of Taung for them too to know and understand the cultural significance of the site. Despite the growing literature on community participation in cultural heritage management, little research has been done to compare South Africa with international approaches when it comes to a site like Taung. The article offers a refreshing perspective on palaeoscience by examining the social interactions of the site with the local community or lack thereof.

---

**Author response to Reviewer 1: Round 1**

No response.

---

**Reviewer 2: Round 1**  
**Date completed:** 29 July 2024  
**Recommendation:** Accept / Revisions required / **Resubmit for review** / Resubmit elsewhere / Decline / See comments  
**Conflicts of interest:** None

Does the manuscript fall within the scope of SAJS?

Yes/No

Is the manuscript written in a style suitable for a non-specialist and is it of wider interest than to specialists alone?

Yes/No

Does the manuscript contain sufficient novel and significant information to justify publication?

Yes/No

Do the Title and Abstract clearly and accurately reflect the content of the manuscript?

Yes/No

Is the research problem significant and concisely stated?

Yes/No

Are the methods described comprehensively?

Yes/No

Is the statistical treatment appropriate?

Yes/No/Not applicable/Not qualified to judge

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the research results?

Yes/Partly/No

Please rate the manuscript on overall contribution to the field

Excellent/Good/Average/Below average/Poor

Please rate the manuscript on language, grammar and tone

Excellent/Good/Average/Below average/Poor

Is the manuscript succinct and free of repetition and redundancies?

Yes/No

Are the results and discussion confined to relevance to the objective(s)?

Yes/No

The number of tables in the manuscript is

Too few/Adequate/Too many/Not applicable

The number of figures in the manuscript is

Too few/Adequate/Too many/Not applicable

Is the supplementary material relevant and separated appropriately from the main document?

Yes/No/Not applicable

Please rate the manuscript on overall quality

Excellent/Good/Average/Below average/Poor

Is appropriate and adequate reference made to other work in the field?

Yes/No

Is it stated that ethical approval was granted by an institutional ethics committee for studies involving human subjects and non-human vertebrates?

Yes/No/Not applicable

If accepted, would you recommend that the article receives priority publication?

Yes/No

Are you willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

Yes/No

Select a recommendation:

Accept / Revisions required / **Resubmit for review** / Decline

With regard to our policy on '[Publishing peer review reports](#)', do you give us permission to publish your anonymised peer review report alongside the authors' response, as a supplementary file to the published article? Publication is voluntary and only with permission from both yourself and the author.

Yes/No

**Comments to the Author:**

This paper reviews to what extent the Taung fossil discovery has impacted the local community at Taung. This is an important topic and it deserves attention in the South African Journal of Science. To my mind, the manuscript has to be improved before it can be published though. As the topic is clearly important, I try to give detailed feedback which I hope will assist the authors.

I recommend the authors address three main topics:

- Present the data on the community research that is mentioned (line 171-172). This research represents the main relevant source of data on the stated main goal of providing the views of the local inhabitants. Yet the data itself is not presented so statements made on the basis of it cannot be evaluated.
- Provide data on community engagement (or lack thereof) of govt. parties such as province, municipality and site management authority (e.g. review the official reports/policy documents of relevant parties) and on the functioning of the site currently.
- Provide a clearer structure, phrasing the research question more clearly and address some currently unaddressed administrative stakeholders and their relationships.

A fourth issue is to support some bold statements with references and instances.

Below I outline how the authors could accomplish this.

Data on community research:

To be able to evaluate the statements on the community views, the paper at least needs to include:

- A list of the questions asked (can be in a table)
- Data on how many respondents there were (if anonymity allows, give some basic demographic statistics like gender, ethnicity, age)
- Proportions of different responses that were given (can be illustrated in graphs).
- If (part) of the data is already published, add a reference and give a clearer summary of the data.

Govt and other parties:

Similarly, it would be very helpful if data on if and how the management authority and other govt. agencies conducted community engagement and the results of this could be added/summarised (e.g. through citing govt. reports, through documents related to the One Plan (mentioned in line 302 ff). Line 282 seems to suggest some work has been performed yet the authors feel that parties can do better. It should be specified what was done, so the reader can evaluate where there is room for improvement. Were local communities involved in the OnePlan or not at all? And if they were, how? Were only traditional leaders consulted, or was a more community-wide consultation done?

Further, there is a detailed description of facilities and improvements at the site. But this is not really functional at present. It would be really helpful if data was added to this on e.g. visitor numbers, operating profit/loss, and foreseen impact in e.g. management plans.

Structure and unaddressed administrative issues:

I recommend the authors add an introduction where they briefly state the occasion (100 year anniversary of discovery), the research question (how does community see the importance of the fossil and what does community want to see happen with the site and the fossil to potentially benefit the them), and the legal context that makes this a pressing issue (goal 4 of the paleosciences strategy, now only mentioned on p.4, line 130 ff).

Perhaps this can be followed up with the research history and site background and also the "past" part of the section a view from the community: past and present". The "present" part of that section I would put separately and in this section I would present the available data from community interviews (see above).

In the background of the site, the authors should also address the relationship of Taung to the wider World Heritage Site. Taung is not inscribed on its own, but as an extension to the previously existing listing "fossil hominid sites of South Africa" (<https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/915>).

I recommend that the authors review how the Taung management authority relates to the overarching management authority. Do the authors think there is a discrepancy in how funds are distributed across the

different elements of the UNESCO listing? (and is there data on this?). Also it would be good to briefly summarise the community engagement (or lack thereof) for the UNESCO listing as a whole (e.g. what do the authors think of Maropeng, where fossils are on display).

Further administrative issues are the legal curatorial framework and curatorial policies of relevant institutions. Statements such as on line 143-144: "It is unfortunate that Dart's territorial practice is still very much in use, even with all the legislative Acts in place regarding heritage management in the country." seem unproductive and are in the current version unsupported.

The following lines suggest that it is the curatorial policies which are the actual bone of contention. It would be good to include a brief sketch of responsibilities of the main parties (SAHRA, Wits) and the legal framework and actual policy formulations.

Minor suggestions:

The title might benefit from the addition of a subtitle explaining that the review focuses on the perceptions of the fossil by local communities and their views on its curation and importance.

Some sections are unclear and under referenced.

Specific examples:

Line 55-58: This would benefit from added specificity. The current average inhabitant is not female, but non-binary as presumably there are some men living in the area as well. It may be better to state things more clearly: females in the majority (x%), black africans the biggest ethnic group (x%), the majority (55.8%) under the poverty line with average income R1000. (And perhaps for reference give the threshold of the poverty line).

Line 102-103: extreme bias towards researchers as recipients of this engagement is observed contributing to the maintenance of the status quo.

This requires numbers and a source, and specification of what the bias is. Are non-researchers underrepresented? (This is the literal meaning of the sentence). If so give numbers of researchers vs. non-researchers. Or are African researchers underrepresented (this is perhaps what the authors are actually concerned about in view of line 104). If so: give breakdown of demographics and specify how the bias works.

Line 138-139: "Since its discovery, ownership of the Taung Child has been a bone of contention between the curatorial facility and the local community. "In the original publication Dart thanks the owner of the fossil for letting him study it. Apparently later, a conflict arose over the ownership. Document this and the process by which ownership was transferred to Wits.

Was there court involvement? Are there records at Wits or UNESCO? Is there longstanding community involvement that can be cited?

Line 250-253: "Regardless of the legal statutes in place, access to these rare finds is still influenced by the scientists who continue to establish themselves as the de facto heritage owners and decision makers. This is also regrettably fueled with personal vendettas which are underlain by racial connotations."

This is a very bold blanket statement and esp. the racial dimension of access should be illustrated by examples and supported by references. Otherwise it should be rephrased for specificity or removed.

Line 239-244: This section really needs to refer to data on the outreach initiatives of 2015 and 2017 and references to the results should be provided. If they have not been published yet, the relevant data need to be presented in this paper.

Added tables (data presentation), figures (fossil, current state of the site, etc.) would make the paper more attractive.

### Author response to Reviewer 2: Round 1

Present the data on the community research that is mentioned (line 171-172). This research represents the main relevant source of data on the stated main goal of providing the views of the local inhabitants. Yet the data itself is not presented so statements made on the basis of it cannot be evaluated.

AUTHOR: Done. Although it was never published, the data collected on previous work done on Taung is included.

Provide data on community engagement (or lack thereof) of govt. parties such as province, municipality and site management authority (e.g. review the official reports/policy documents of relevant parties) and on the functioning of the site currently.

AUTHOR: Done.

Provide a clearer structure, phrasing the research question more clearly and address some currently unaddressed administrative stakeholders and their relationships.

A fourth issue is to support some bold statements with references and instances.

Below I outline how the authors could accomplish this.

Data on community research:

To be able to evaluate the statements on the community views, the paper at least needs to include:

- A list of the questions asked (can be in a table)
- Data on how many respondents there were (if anonymity allows, give some basic demographic statistics like gender, ethnicity, age)
- Proportions of different responses that were given (can be illustrated in graphs).
- If (part) of the data is already published, add a reference and give a clearer summary of the data.

AUTHOR: Done. The graphs with responses is included in the graph.

Govt and other parties:

Similarly, it would be very helpful if data on if and how the management authority and other govt. agencies conducted community engagement and the results of this could be added/summarised (e.g. through citing govt. reports, through documents related to the One Plan (mentioned in line 302 ff). Line 282 seems to suggest some work has been performed yet the authors feel that parties can do better. It should be specified what was done, so the reader can evaluate where there is room for improvement. Were local communities involved in the OnePlan or not at all? And if they were, how? Were only traditional leaders consulted, or was a more community-wide consultation done?

Further, there is a detailed description of facilities and improvements at the site. But this is not really functional at present. It would be really helpful if data was added to this on e.g. visitor numbers, operating profit/loss, and foreseen impact in e.g. management plans.

AUTHOR: Done. A paragraph is added to the manuscript.

Structure and unaddressed administrative issues

I recommend the authors add an introduction where they briefly state the occasion (100 year anniversary of discovery), the research question (how does community see the importance of the fossil and what does community want to see happen with the site and the fossil to potentially benefit the them), and the legal context that makes this a pressing issue (goal 4 of the paleosciences strategy, now only mentioned on p.4, line 130 ff).

AUTHOR: This is already detailed in the manuscript. The community believe the restitution of the skull will bring economic development to the area.

Perhaps this can be followed up with the research history and site background and also the "past" part of the section a view from the community: past and present". The "present" part of that section I would put

separately and in this section I would present the available data from community interviews (see above).

AUTHOR: The summary of the results of the recent community interviews is expanded on.

In the background of the site, the authors should also address the relationship of Taung to the wider World Heritage Site. Taung is not inscribed on its own, but as an extension to the previously existing listing "fossil hominid sites of South Africa" (<https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/915>).

AUTHOR: Done.

I recommend that the authors review how the Taung management authority relates to the overarching management authority. Do the authors think there is a discrepancy in how funds are distributed across the different elements of the UNESCO listing? (and is there data on this?). Also it would be good to briefly summarise the community engagement (or lack thereof) for the UNESCO listing as a whole (e.g. what do the authors think of Maropeng, where fossils are on display).

Further administrative issues are the legal curatorial framework and curatorial policies of relevant institutions. Statements such as on line 143-144: "It is unfortunate that Dart's territorial practice is still very much in use, even with all the legislative Acts in place regarding heritage management in the country." seem unproductive and are in the current version unsupported.

The following lines suggest that it is the curatorial policies which are the actual bone of contention. It would be good to include a brief sketch of responsibilities of the main parties (SAHRA, Wits) and the legal framework and actual policy formulations.

Minor suggestions:

The title might benefit from the addition of a subtitle explaining that the review focuses on the perceptions of the fossil by local communities and their views on its curation and importance.

Some sections are unclear and under referenced.

Specific examples:

Line 55-58: This would benefit from added specificity. The current average inhabitant is not female, but non-binary as presumably there are some men living in the area as well. It may be better to state things more clearly: females in the majority (x%), black africans the biggest ethnic group (x%), the majority (55.8%) under the poverty line with average income R1000. (And perhaps for reference give the threshold of the poverty line).

AUTHOR: Done.

Line 102-103: extreme bias towards researchers as recipients of this engagement is observed contributing to the maintenance of the status quo.

This requires numbers and a source, and specification of what the bias is. Are non-researchers underrepresented? (This is the literal meaning of the sentence). If so give numbers of researchers vs. non-researchers. Or are African researchers underrepresented (this is perhaps what the authors are actually concerned about in view of line 104). If so: give breakdown of demographics and specify how the bias works.

AUTHOR: Done.

Line 138-139: "Since its discovery, ownership of the Taung Child has been a bone of contention between the curatorial facility and the local community. "In the original publication Dart thanks the owner of the fossil for letting him study it. Apparently later, a conflict arose over the ownership. Document this and the process by which ownership was transferred to Wits.

Was there court involvement? Are there records at Wits or UNESCO? Is there longstanding community involvement that can be cited?

---

AUTHOR: There were never involvements of the courts. However, there have been several engagements over the years between the North West Province and the Wits University regarding the return of the skull to the place of discovery.

Line 250-253: "Regardless of the legal statutes in place, access to these rare finds is still influenced by the scientists who continue to establish themselves as the de facto heritage owners and decision makers. This is also regrettably fuelled with personal vendettas which are underlain by racial connotations."

This is a very bold blanket statement and esp. the racial dimension of access should be illustrated by examples and supported by references. Otherwise it should be rephrased for specificity or removed.

AUTHOR: The sentence is rephrased.

Line 239-244: This section really needs to refer to data on the outreach initiatives of 2015 and 2017 and references to the results should be provided. If they have not been published yet, the relevant data need to be presented in this paper.

Added tables (data presentation), figures (fossil, current state of the site, etc) would make the paper more attractive.

AUTHOR: Tables, figures and pictures are added.

---

### Reviewer 2: Round 2

**Date completed:** 03 November 2024

**Recommendation:** **Accept** / Revisions required / Resubmit for review / Resubmit elsewhere / Decline / See comments

**Conflicts of interest:** None

---

Does the manuscript fall within the scope of SAJS?

Yes/No

Is the manuscript written in a style suitable for a non-specialist and is it of wider interest than to specialists alone?

Yes/No

Does the manuscript contain sufficient novel and significant information to justify publication?

Yes/No

Do the Title and Abstract clearly and accurately reflect the content of the manuscript?

Yes/No

Is the research problem significant and concisely stated?

Yes/No

Are the methods described comprehensively?

Yes/No

Is the statistical treatment appropriate?

Yes/No/**Not applicable**/Not qualified to judge

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the research results?

Yes/Partly/No

Please rate the manuscript on overall contribution to the field

Excellent/**Good**/Average/Below average/Poor

Please rate the manuscript on language, grammar and tone

Excellent/**Good**/Average/Below average/Poor

Is the manuscript succinct and free of repetition and redundancies?

Yes/No

Are the results and discussion confined to relevance to the objective(s)?

Yes/No

The number of tables in the manuscript is

Too few/**Adequate**/Too many/Not applicable

---



The number of figures in the manuscript is
Too few/ <b>Adequate</b> /Too many/Not applicable
Is the supplementary material relevant and separated appropriately from the main document?
Yes/No/ <b>Not applicable</b>
Please rate the manuscript on overall quality
Excellent/ <b>Good</b> /Average/Below average/Poor
Is appropriate and adequate reference made to other work in the field?
<b>Yes/No</b>
Is it stated that ethical approval was granted by an institutional ethics committee for studies involving human subjects and non-human vertebrates?
Yes/No/ <b>Not applicable</b>
If accepted, would you recommend that the article receives priority publication?
<b>Yes/No</b>
Are you willing to review a revision of this manuscript?
<b>Yes/No</b>
Select a recommendation:
<b>Accept</b> / Revisions required / Resubmit for review / Decline
With regard to our policy on ' <u>Publishing peer review reports</u> ', do you give us permission to publish your anonymised peer review report alongside the authors' response, as a supplementary file to the published article? Publication is voluntary and only with permission from both yourself and the author.
<b>Yes/No</b>
<b>Comments to the Author:</b>
I thank the authors for their consideration of my comments on a previous version. The contribution is certainly thought-provoking and challenges the scientific community to reflect on how we can better ensure that a system of true co-creation, which is especially important in a field drawing data from sites in rural areas often home to marginalised communities. I recommend publication with some minor editorial work.
One suggestion that I would make to the authors is to consider removing some seemingly tangential paragraphs, which may help drive home the central message more forcefully. To my mind e.g. the parts on teaching human evolution in schools and biodiversity/wetland conservation were slightly distracting from the main topic of stakeholder engagement at Taung.
I have some specific textual suggestions:
Line 81: "magistrate" should be "magisterial district"?
Line 101 ..."as a world heritage". Unfinished sentence, add "site"?
Line 150: "high" should be "higher"?
Line 167: "that the masses lacks" should be "that the masses lack"?
Line 196: "via palaeosciences" should be "via the palaeosciences"?
Line 236: "this tends to leads" should be "this tends to lead"
Line 288-291: repetition of same sentence
Line 324: consider changing "locals" to something like "community members"?
Line 333: "does not seem to intensity" sentence seems unfinished. Unsure what is meant
Line 386-387: "is outweighed" should be "are outweighed"?

---

**Author response to Reviewer 2: Round 2**

See response to Associate Editor.

---

**Associate Editor comments to Author: Round 2**

Thank you for sharing your improved and revised manuscript. I have a few outstanding concerns, most of which are relatively minor:

1. Most critical, please can you share the ethical clearance details regarding the data presented in Fig. This will need to be included in the Acknowledgements. The Online Publishing System Administrator can advise but I think you will need to cite this as unpublished data.
2. Please correct spelling of 'magistraterial' to 'magisterial'
3. Typo - 'scommunity ite lies 'off the beaten track' - change to 'community lies...'
4. 'Harvesting of woods' - wood should be singular
5. 'However, despite wetlands being their source of economic socio economic needs such as source of water for irrigation purposes, crop production and fishing'. Suggest changing to 'However, despite wetlands providing important ecosystem services such as source of water for irrigation, recreation and tourism, fishing and spiritual value..' (however, please do take note of point 7 below)
6. ...following from above 'fishing; communities have been recorded to support wetlands conservation<sup>40</sup>' Here you cite a study from a village in another province so it's not appropriate to generalise or extrapolate this support. You could include this reference but it would need to be properly contextualised. (however, please do take note of point 7 below)
7. I partially agree with the reviewer's concerns about some sections distracting from the main argument (curriculum and wetland conservation) and note your rebuttal argument. In the case of the national curriculum argument I think the link between this discussion and the main theme is made adequately and can be left as is. However, in the case of the wetland protection discussion I do agree with the reviewer that this section comes out of the blue. My suggestion is to better introduce and contextualise the importance of this wetland at the site, and to keep the discussion brief as the current paragraphs do go off on a tangent about wetland conservation.

---

#### Author response to Associate Editor: Round 2

Most critical, please can you share the ethical clearance details regarding the data presented in Fig. 1. This will need to be included in the Acknowledgements. Nadia can advise but I think you will need to cite this as unpublished data.

AUTHOR: Based on the advice from the editors, we reached out to the Wits Research Ethics Department, to track down the records of the ethical clearance that was to be applied back in 2016 when the bulk of the outreach was done, and this was not successful. The ethical clearance was to be applied when several projects were to be undertaken at the Taung site.

We have since removed the table of the sample questions and the graph, and left only the narrative speaking briefly about the outreach activities that took place in Taung. We however acknowledge that the questions and the graph added significant content to the paper.

We also attempted to reduce the short narrative paragraph regarding the outreach activities, but realised that we will be excluding the interactions that took place at the site, to address the glaring knowledge gap and the lack of inclusivity needed by the community members. If this is not acceptable to the reviewers, we will reduce it significantly.

Please correct spelling of 'magistraterial' to 'magisterial'

AUTHOR: Done.

Typo - 'scommunity ite lies 'off the beaten track' - change to 'community lies...'

AUTHOR: The statement reads "The site lies 'off the beaten track',.

'Harvesting of woods' - wood should be singular

AUTHOR: Done

However, despite wetlands being their source of economic socio economic needs such as source of water for irrigation purposes, crop production and fishing'. Suggest changing to 'However, despite wetlands providing important ecosystem services such as source of water for irrigation, recreation and tourism, fishing and spiritual value..' (however, please do take note of point 7 below)

AUTHOR: Done. The line is addressed as a collective with the comment offered at point 7.

...following from above 'fishing; communities have been recorded to support wetlands conservation<sup>40</sup>' Here you cite a study from a village in another province so it's not appropriate to generalise or extrapolate

this support. You could include this reference but it would need to be properly contextualised. (however, please do take note of point 7 below)

AUTHOR: Done. The line is addressed as a collective with the comment offered at point 7.

I partially agree with the reviewer's concerns about some sections distracting from the main argument (curriculum and wetland conservation) and note your rebuttal argument. In the case of the national curriculum argument I think the link between this discussion and the main theme is made adequately and can be left as is. However, in the case of the wetland protection discussion I do agree with the reviewer that this section comes out of the blue. My suggestion is to better introduce and contextualise the importance of this wetland at the site, and to keep the discussion brief as the current paragraphs do go off on a tangent about wetland conservation.

AUTHOR: Done. The section has been shortened, to only introduce the wetland as a feature at the site.

---

### **Reviewer 2: Round 3**

**Date completed:** 15 January 2025

**Recommendation:** **Accept** / Revisions required / Resubmit for review / Resubmit elsewhere / Decline / See comments

**Conflicts of interest:** None

#### **Comments to the Author:**

I had wanted to thank the authors for sticking with the manuscript through what must have been at times a frustrating process.

There was one minor editing issue, line 72-72. " The wider administrative unit of Dr Ruth S Mogomotsi Mompoti, which is inclusive of the Greater Taung Local Municipality", might for non-SA readers be confusing as they might interpret Dr Ruth S Mogomotsi Mompoti as the administrator, while it is the name of the unit, named in her honour. I am unsure how to resolve this though without adding many words.

To my mind it is good to go as is.