

August 14, 2008

Professor Kevin J. Krizek
Editor of *Journal of Transport and Land Use*

Dear Kevin,

Attached please find the final version of our paper “Managing the accessibility on mass public transit: the case of Hong Kong” submitted for publication in *Journal of Transport and Land Use*.

We appreciate the valuable comments of the two anonymous referees. Please thank them for us. In response to their comments, we have further enhanced the paper so that the results and findings are more clearly presented. In particular, we have made the following major changes in this final version:

1. In Section 4, we have substantially expanded the exposition of the case study on urban density, added a sensitivity study of the urban density on profitability of the rail service, and substantiated the results with more discussions.
2. In Section 5 and throughout this paper, we have replaced “Total Operating Cost after Depreciation” by “Total Operating Cost plus Capital Depreciation” and made other relevant amendments.
3. We have substantially rewritten Section 6 (Concluding Remarks) by summarizing the findings in the three aspects of this study and relating them to our research objective.

In the following, we delineate our responses to their comments.

Responses to Referee A’s comments

We appreciate his/her valuable comments.

Comment: “The lack of substantiation by showing just one single figure”

Response: We have added Figure 2 in Section 4.2 to explain in more detail the calculation of urban density, and Figure 3 to illustrate the sensitivity of urban density on the profit margin of the service.

All the other editorial comments have been incorporated. Thanks.

Responses to Referee B’s comments

We thank his/her encouraging comments and suggestions.

Comment: “How far out does the minimum density of 31,500 people per square kilometer need to extend? Does this density need to extend beyond the walkable catchment of a rail station? How does this density account for feeder transit services”

Response: The effect of the feeder bus service is included in the model. The feeder bus service takes passengers from beyond the walkable catchment to the rail stations. In the logit split model, the walking distance and feeder bus travel time are part of the access cost for rail passengers as reflected in eqn (2). Therefore, farther away from the stations, the proportion of passenger demand for the rail service is lower. A discussion of the feeder bus service has been added in Section 4.2.

Comment: “The extent of the density that needs to increase without value capture of real estate”

Response: We have added Figure 3 to show the sensitivity of urban density on the profit margin of the rail service. According to this result, without value capture of real estate, the minimum urban density needs to be scaled up to 42,000 /km². A discussion of this point has been added in Section 4.2. Please refer to major change 1. above.

Comment: “The confusion with respect to Total Operating Cost after Depreciation”

Response: We have replaced “Total Operating Cost after Depreciation” by “Total Operating Cost plus Capital Depreciation” as suggested and made other relevant amendments accordingly. Please refer to major change 2. above.

Comment: “A bit more in the conclusions that summarize why the three different sections of study were chosen and how they feed into the conclusion”

Response: We have rewritten the conclusions by summarizing the findings in the three aspects of study. Please refer to major change 3. above.

Again, all the editorial comments have been incorporated. Thanks.

We hope that these have addressed the referees’ comments. We are looking forward to hearing from you soon again regarding the status of this revised paper. Thank you very much for taking care of this review process for us.

Sincerely,