

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JESBS_121994</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Experiential Factors as a Determinant for Climate Change Mitigation Behavior: A case of Tourist Hotel Managers in Naivasha Sub-County, Kenya</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript addresses a topic of significant importance to the scientific community, particularly in the context of tourism and CCMB. Its contributions offer valuable insights that could enhance current understanding and practices within the field. The manuscript's thorough analysis and robust methodology demonstrate a strong potential for advancing scholarly discourse and influencing future research directions.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>Based on the review of the content, the title seems appropriate as long as it encapsulates the main themes and findings of the research effectively.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract of the article is relevant and appropriately structured. I recommend expanding the methodology section, specifically detailing point 3.6 concerning data management and analysis, with a focus on the statistical methods employed in the research (e.g. PCA, results of Cronbach's alpha and the use of statistical softwares).</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The organization of the content allows for a logical flow of information, making it easier for readers to follow the research process and understand the findings. Each section is well-defined and contributes effectively to the overall coherence of the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, particularly in its examination of the behaviours of Kenya's tourist hotel managers in response to climate change. The study employs a comprehensive methodology that captures the nuanced ways in which personal experiences with extreme weather events influence mitigation practices among these managers. By utilizing a structured self-administered questionnaire, the research effectively gathers data on the specific climate change mitigation behaviours adopted by hotel managers, allowing for a detailed analysis of their responses to environmental challenges. Furthermore, the identification of two distinct factors underlying these behaviours (efficiency and curtailment) provides valuable insights into the motivations and practices of hotel managers in Naivasha Sub-County, thereby contributing to a deeper understanding of the socio-cultural dynamics at play in the tourism sector's response to climate change in Kenya.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>The references cited in the manuscript appear to be relevant and provide a solid foundation for the study.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, demonstrating a clear and coherent structure that effectively conveys the research objectives, methodology, and findings. The use of technical terminology is appropriate for the target audience, and the manuscript maintains a formal tone consistent with academic writing standards.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Here are some optional / general comments that could enhance the manuscript:</p> <p><b>Visual aids:</b> consider incorporating more visual aids, such as charts or graphs, to illustrate key findings. Visual representations can enhance understanding and retention of complex data, particularly in the context of statistical results.</p> <p><b>Discussion of implications:</b> expanding the discussion on the implications of the findings for policy and practice in the tourism sector could provide valuable insights for stakeholders. This could include recommendations for hotel managers on best practices for climate change mitigation.</p> <p><b>Limitations and future research:</b> a more explicit acknowledgment of the study’s limitations and suggestions for future research would strengthen the manuscript. Discussing potential biases, sample size limitations, or geographical constraints can provide a more balanced view of the research.</p> <p><b>Engagement with local context:</b> given the focus on Kenya, incorporating more local context or case studies could enrich the analysis. This might include specific examples of successful climate change initiatives within the Kenyan tourism sector.</p> <p><b>Interdisciplinary perspectives:</b> integrating perspectives from related fields, such as environmental science or economics, could provide a more holistic view of the challenges and opportunities facing the tourism industry in the context of climate change.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer’s comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author’s comment</b> (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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Pablo Raúl Manzano Insuasti</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Universidad Anáhuac, México</b></p>