

**Author's response to reviews**

**Title:** The potential monetary benefits of reclaiming hazardous waste sites in the Campania region: an economic evaluation.

**Authors:**

Carla Guerriero ([Carla.Guerriero@lshtm.ac.uk](mailto:Carla.Guerriero@lshtm.ac.uk))  
John Cairns ([John.Cairns@lshtm.ac.uk](mailto:John.Cairns@lshtm.ac.uk))

**Version:** 4 **Date:** 3 June 2009

**Author's response to reviews:** see over

Dear Sir/ Madam,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to revise our paper. We are grateful to the referees for the evident care with which they read our paper. We have addressed the comments of the reviewer and we have improved the overall format of the paper according to the Journal editor's suggestion. We report our responses below.

## **Reviewer: Stacy E Sneeringer**

### **First comment:**

We agree with the reviewer's comment and we have revised the text trying to use consistently the same tense (present tense) across all the paper.

### **Second comment:**

The abbreviation IARC has been substituted with the full name: International Agency for Research on Cancer.

### **Third comment:**

A citation referring to the sentence has been added.

### **Fourth Comment:**

The official body that declared a waste crisis is quoted and a reference has been added.

### **Fifth comment:**

We substituted the sentence "last seven years" with the actual years.

### **Sixth comment:**

The EC suggested values (upper, baseline and lower) come from three different studies. The baseline estimate (adjusted for age and updated to 2007 prices) comes from the UK Department of Environment and Transport (1999). It has been selected as the best estimate as it is based upon a number of consistent Contingent Valuation studies and therefore provides a stronger estimate. The lower value has been taken from a study by Krupnick *et al.* (2000) on the Value of a Prevented Fatality among the elderly population

of Ontario .While the recommended upper estimate was based on a review of earlier valuation studies. All the three studies estimate the VPF for a non-cancer immediate death (for example, the baseline estimate evaluate the WTP for preventing a transport fatality). Therefore we agree with the reviewer and we specified that we inflated the values by 50% because people would pay more to avert a case of fatal cancer than a fatality not preceded by a long period of illness and psychological distress.

**Seventh comment:**

According to reviewer's suggestion we mentioned that the 50% increase was made as per EC recommendations.