

Michael A. Henning  
Department of Mathematics  
University of Johannesburg  
Auckland Park, 2006  
South Africa

02 April, 2014

Professor Prof. Michael Krivelevich  
Managing Editor  
Electronic Journal of Combinatorics

Dear Professor Krivelevich:

**Paper:** Total Transversals and Total Domination in Uniform Hypergraphs  
**Author:** Bujtás, Henning, Tuza, Yeo  
**Journal:** Electronic Journal of Combinatorics

Thank you for your email dated 20 March 2014, wherein you inform us that you have provisionally accepted our paper for publication in the Electronic Journal of Combinatorics. We are delighted to hear this news!

We wish to express our sincere thanks to the reviewer for doing an outstanding job with reviewing the paper and checking every detail with meticulous precision and care. The time and efforts taken by the reviewer is much appreciated.

We wish to thank the reviewer for his/her positive report. The reviewer lists eighteen (18) changes/corrections to be made. These are minor changes and easy to make, but are nonetheless very important changes indeed. All eighteen changes of the reviewer have been addressed and the changes have been made, with thanks.

In particular, the revised draft incorporates the following changes:

- Shortened the proof of Lemma 9 and reduced some parts of the Introduction (see Comment #1 of the Reviewer).
- Moved Definitions 3 and 4 to appear immediately before Observation 3 (see Comment #2 of the Reviewer).
- Explained why Theorem 3 is not true for large  $k$  (see Comment #3 of the Reviewer). In particular, we have shown that for all  $k \geq 3$ ,

$$\sup_{H \in \mathcal{H}_k} \frac{\gamma_t(H)}{n_H} = (1 + o(1)) \frac{\ln(k)}{k}.$$

- Consistently used the expression “open neighborhood” (see Comment #4 of the Reviewer).
- Deleted the expression “for  $k$  sufficiently large” in the formulation of Theorem 6 (see Comment #5 of the Reviewer).
- Made the minor changes/corrections listed in Comments #6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 of the Reviewer.
- Reformulated Claim B in a similar way to the formulation of Claim II (see Comment #8 of the Reviewer).
- Consistently used the definition of  $H - X$  (see Comment #13 of the Reviewer).

Thank you for your assistance and for your consideration of the revised manuscript.

Yours sincerely

Michael A. Henning  
 Email: mahenning@uj.ac.za