

Thank you for reviewing this paper. My response to the referee can be found below in bold

The paper describes an interesting SALT- and Gemini-based study of brightest cluster galaxies. The study focuses on determining the properties and excitation mechanisms determined from an analysis of the optical emission lines in the nucleus as well as off centre. This proceedings paper lists the results for Hydra A, one of 8 objects in the class that form part of the broader study.

The paper is in general well written, and the argumentation is easy to follow. There are relatively many grammatical errors, which are listed at the end of this review. While my overall impression of the project is very positive, my one criticism of the paper is that there is insufficient detail to determine if the line ratios have been determined correctly.

For example, did the authors subtract a normal galaxy spectral template to compensate for absorption features,

>> A paragraph was added at the end of the section 2 to describe this.

and were corrections made for telluric absorption?

>> No, we did not correct for the telluric absorption. A statement is added in p2, s2, l9

How were the line strengths determined?

Was it by fitting Gaussian profiles, or by integrating the area under a continuum fit?

>> Again a paragraph was added at the end of the section 2 to describe this.

How were blended lines dealt with?

>> We have few blended lines but Gandalf is powerful to separate them by fitting a number of Gaussian templates to the emission lines.

There should be an additional paragraph clarifying these and related matters in section 2.

>> DONE

An example of one of the spectra would also be useful, to enable the reader to get a sense of the quality of the data used.

>> The proceeding is limited to 6 pages so there is not enough space for another plot even though I have reduced the number of references used. A paragraph explaining the accuracy of the line ratios determination is added in section 2 instead.

List of smaller errors (page=p, line=l, section=s):

p1, s1, l1: ", and diffuse and extended structures." **DONE**

p1, s1, l9: "In the centre ..." **DONE**

p1, s1, l10: "condenses" **DONE**

p2, s2, l3: "modelled in detail." **DONE**

p3, s3.1, l9: "... purely H II regions exist." **DONE**

p4, s3.4, l5: "... there is harder ..." **DONE**

p5, s4, l7: "... ratios best match the centre ..." **DONE**

p5, s4, l11: *n_e* should be in italics **DONE**

p5, s5, l2-3: "... two year period." **DONE**

p6, Fig 5 caption, l3: "... grid ... is ..." or "... grids ... are ..." **DONE**

p6, Fig 5 caption, l4-5: the "minus" signs are all incorrectly given as "short dashes"
DONE