**Re: submission to Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work, *"Young people empathising with other animals: reflections on an Australian RSPCA Humane Education Program".***

Dear Liz et al on the Editorial Committee,

Thanks very much for the feedback. Below is a chart identifying the changes we have made.

Heather, on behalf of our research team.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Reviewer A comments and suggestions** | **Our response** | **Page no** |
| An original piece both in regard to the subject matter (young people from migrant backgrounds, empathy, animal welfare) and in terms of the original research. | Thanks | n/a |
| Well resourced and fluent approach to reviewing the literature in regard to empathy. | We appreciate this feedback | n/a |
| Yes - inter-species relationships being the focus, this will be new ground for many social workers. Food (or maybe not food!) for thought. | Yes, it will be new for many | n/a |
| A welcome and groundbreaking piece of research, thank you. | How generous of you to say so. Many thanks. | n/a |
|  |  |  |
| **Reviewer B comments and suggestions** | **Our response** | **Page no** |
| Partly empirical - an illustrative example to increasing empathy in your people from a new arrival background. Partly literature review - the literature review needs to be more focused on interspecies empathy - I suggest the author(s) read some of the chapter in Ryan (2014)(Ed.) Animals and Social Work - Why and how they matter. Palgrave Macmillan, to strengthen this focus. | Yes, that description captures this paper.  In terms of citing Ryan, we do refer to his book from 2011. However, we have now included material from the suggested 2014 reference. Specifically:  *Ryan’s (2014) edited collection, Animals in Social Work: Why and How They Matter, is an exception. In it are a range of philosophical and theoretical considerations, before presenting several practical applications, such as the Burke and Iannuzzi chapter on Animal Assisted Therapy for children on the Autism Spectrum, or the one from Walsh about domestic violence and companion animal welfare (Ryan, 2014).* | p. 3 |
| The general empathy material can be reduced to one or two paragraphs. | Below we have identified material edited out. However, on close inspection of other parts of the discussion we think that given Reviewer A liked it and readers might appreciate the breadth of discussion about empathy esp in relation to social work practice we have not cut it back to 2 paragraphs.  Material removed to shorten general section on empathy:  “Barker (2003) underlines the concept of ‘attunement’ that refers to emotionally but also cognitively attuned behaviours. King (2011, p.680) also describes the emotional, cognitive and behavioural dimensions of empathy, noting that, “Empathy helps one both to anticipate the behavior of another and to amend one’s own decisions and actions accordingly”. | p. 4. |
| The illustrative example, the RSPCA CARE programme - should be expanded as this is the key import of this paper. | We have expanded this by including some more information about the program and some visual descriptions, via photographs of young people participating in it. To literally illustrate the program (visible, embodied and in action) we provide descriptions of 8 photographs taken while the young people were interacting with animals. | p. 10-11 |
| The research questions should inform this discussion. | Sorry we thought they did. We have made no changes as a result.  To reiterate, our research questions are:  *(1) Why is empathy important to social work with young people? (2) What can an Australian RSPCA Humane Education Program (HEP) teach social workers about the benefits of interspecies empathy for young people?* | n/a |
| The main themes in the final paragraph of the illustrative example section should structure the innings section - this is only undertaken in part at present. | Good suggestion. This has made the paper much clearer/stronger. We now have a) to e) subheadings to signpost the findings more clearly | Pp12-17 |
| There is some good discussion in the conclusion that could be repositioned back into the literature review section and the conclusion used to be more deliberately focused on answering the research questions. | Interesting idea. We’ve played around with it and have relocated the following section from the conclusion to the lit review:  *Interspecies empathy can serve as a bridge to many people (Serpell, 2000), including ‘difficult to reach’ clients battling the legacy of past abuse, mental health problems, poverty, homelessness and chronic illness. Young or old(er), tough, defensive and angry clients may not be anything like this towards animals (Bathurst & Lunghofer, 2016), including animals they may have rescued from shelters. Reciprocal benefits can accrue to the humans and other animals that ‘rescue each other’, that is, humans rescuing otherwise unwanted and soon to be euthanized shelter animals and shelter animals rescuing humans from their own reports of isolation, loneliness, anxiety and depression (Authors 2017a; 2017b).* | From p. 18  To p. 4 |
| No discussion on the Treaty but not really relevant to the content - perhaps a discussion re power and how the dominant discourse of social work - humanism needs o be expanded to a post humanist all inclusive ecology would be helpful esp linked into the blinkered view of social work on ignoring animals (Ryan 2011) | We appreciate this suggestion but in another paper (Fraser and Taylor in press) we consider this very issue, as we do in a forthcoming chapter. So we’ll leave it for this paper if that’s okay by you. | p. 2 |
| Clear and well referenced | Thanks. We’ve done another rake over to check they are all in order post revisions. | Throughout |