

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_124330
Title of the Manuscript:	MANIFESTATION AND MANAGEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE- AN ANALYSIS OF THE OLD TOWNS OF KENYAN COASTAL REGION
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>I feel that the manuscript makes an important contribution to the field cultural heritage management and tourism. The findings contribute to the broader understanding of how cultural heritage is preserved and transformed within communities, both tangibly and intangibly. Another positive is that the study is set in an under-researched cultural context. Finally, the recommendations to develop tourism as a means of preserving and benefiting cultural heritage speak directly to ongoing debates in sustainable tourism—connecting tourism activity with local cultural heritage offers a pathway for long-term preservation.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is suitable. However, a colon would be more appropriate than the single dash after “Cultural Heritage”; i.e., <i>Manifestation and Management of Cultural Heritage: An Analysis of the Old Towns of Kenya's Coastal Region</i></p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive and effective overall. However, some of the information regarding the population and sample size could be presented more effectively. The sentence “The target population of 470 comprised of elders, house hold leaders and heritage.” is incomplete and could be removed. When it is stated that “The study utilized interview guides”, different types of interview methods use interview guides; specify what type of interview was completed (e.g., semi-structured interviews, cognitive interviews).</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the paper is well structured with good use of thematic headings throughout.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound overall. The exploratory research aim is appropriate given the aims of the paper. The mixed-methods approach is also appropriate for exploring cultural phenomena. However, while the exploratory approach is explained, the methodology itself is not. Content Analysis (Krippendorf, 2014) is discussed in terms of data analysis in section 3.1.4, but this should be introduced clearly in the methodology section as the methodological approach that was used to complete this exploratory study.</p> <p>The mention of a “cross-sectional survey” on Page 8 is unclear. The practical applications of the survey to the research context are not explained. The word “survey” does not appear again in the manuscript beyond the three instances on Page 8.</p> <p>The “multi-stage cluster sampling” described in the abstract is not explained in the methodology section aside from one mention of cluster sampling on Page 10. This should be explained to improve the dependability (trustworthiness) of the manuscript.</p> <p>In section 3.1.3 the type of interview method that utilized an interview guide should be clarified. More information about the interview in general would be beneficial; e.g., What was the average length of interviews? Where were the interviews conducted? Were the interviews recorded?</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are sufficient and recent.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Overall, the language and English quality are good. But there are some minor issues with grammar, sentence structure, and word choice that should be revised prior to publication. For example, on Page 13: "Consequently, as Meethan (2011) noted that relationship between globalization and culture results into increased homogenization and westernization of culture, therefore the aspect of weddings ceremonies changing in the two old towns in coastal region is characterized by Meethans (2011) study whereby there is a lot of similarities with the modern-day wedding." Has several issues. The sentence starts with "Consequently" and later includes "therefore". This is redundant, as both words indicate a conclusion or result. The sentence is also long and wordy, with Meethan being cited twice. The second mention of Meethan also requires a possessive apostrophe (Meethan's). Also, the phrase "there is a lot of similarities" should be "there are a lot of similarities" to match the plural noun "similarities."</p> <p>On Page 22 it is stated that "the following conclusions" (i.e., more than one conclusion) will be discussed. Then the next sentence introduces the "First" conclusion. But the second conclusion, or subsequent conclusions are not clear.</p> <p>Capitalization of Fort Jesus (place name) on Page 25.</p> <p>On Pages 16 and 17 the possessive apostrophe is used incorrectly (e.g., "1500's" and "1600's"). These should be 1500s and 1600s</p> <p>Several paragraphs on pages 23 and 24 begin with a dash (-).</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Section 7 Recommendations provides several good suggestions for stakeholders to take. However, these have a very functional, micro-focus on the research site. This section would benefit from a more macro/big-picture discussion for suggestions to guide the application of this knowledge both locally and in other similar contexts. This would improve the transferability of the manuscript's key conclusions.</p> <p>There are no instances of plagiarism suspected. There are no competing interests. There are no ethical issues.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Jeff Wahl</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>School of Tourism Management, Capilano University, Canada</p>