

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_121771
Title of the Manuscript:	Cognitive Factors and Climate Change Mitigation Behaviour among Managers of Tourist Hotel Facilities within Naivasha Sub County, Kenya
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>This manuscript is important because it provides insights into the impact of cognitive factors on climate change mitigation behaviors (CCMB) among hotel managers, a topic that has not been extensively studied. By focusing on Naivasha Sub County in Kenya, the research highlights how managers' understanding of climate change influences their environmental practices in a region where such data is sparse. The application of beta regression to analyze these relationships offers a robust statistical approach, adding depth to the findings. The manuscript's contribution lies in its potential to guide targeted interventions and enhance our understanding of cognitive influences on environmental behavior in the hospitality industry, which could lead to more effective climate change strategies.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>"Exploring Cognitive Influences on Climate Change Mitigation Behaviors Among Tourist Hotel Managers in Naivasha, Kenya"</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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objective Clarity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The research objective should be stated more clearly and directly at the beginning of the abstract. 2. Specialized Terms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Clarify or remove the term "pragmatist worldview" as it may be unclear to readers. 3. Statistical Details: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Limit statistical details in the abstract to key results to avoid overwhelming readers. 4. Structure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Improve the organization by dividing the abstract into clear sections: objective, methods, results, and conclusion. 5. Consistency: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Ensure coherence when discussing the impacts of cognitive factors to avoid confusion. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript need several improvements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The introduction is excessively long and includes extensive background information that might overwhelm the reader. Consider condensing the introduction by focusing on the most relevant points directly related to the study. Aim to provide a concise context that leads smoothly to the research objective. o The introduction contains detailed explanations of climate change and its impacts, which are well-known and might not need such extensive coverage in this context. Reducing the focus on basic concepts and moving more quickly to the specific research problem would improve the flow and focus. o While the introduction touches on multiple aspects of climate change and tourism, the main research focus—cognition and climate change mitigation behaviors (CCMB)—is introduced somewhat late. Consider restructuring the introduction to more quickly address the gap in the literature and the specific problem your study aims to solve. 2. Methods and Materials: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The cross-sectional survey design is suitable for this study, but a clearer explanation of why this design was chosen would strengthen the methodology section. It would be helpful to briefly discuss the advantages of this approach, particularly in relation to studying cognitive factors within the given context. o The decision to use Krejcie and Morgan's formula for determining the sample size is appropriate. However, the rationale behind selecting 70 facilities as the final sample size 	

Review Form 3

	<p>could be more concisely articulated. Providing a brief justification for why this number was sufficient to meet the study's objectives would enhance the methodological rigor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The mention of a pragmatism approach is noted, but its influence on the study's methodology is not fully clear. Expanding on how this philosophical approach guided both the study design and data interpretation would provide valuable context for readers. This would help in understanding the broader implications of the study's findings. <p>3. Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The discussion could delve deeper into the reasons behind the variation in findings across different studies. While differences in studied populations and measured indicators are mentioned, the discussion could benefit from a more thorough exploration of why these differences exist and what implications they may have for future research. o Providing examples of the various measures used in different studies would enhance the reader's understanding of the issue. o The discussion should include more concrete suggestions on how the findings can be applied in practice, particularly in the context of policy-making or managerial interventions. What specific steps can be taken by managers or policymakers to improve CCMB in the tourism sector? <p>4. Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The conclusion could benefit from providing more actionable recommendations for managers, policymakers, or educators. While the need for an "intense shift" in behavior is mentioned, the steps required to achieve this shift are not clearly outlined. o The conclusion emphasizes the role of cognition in influencing CCMB but does not sufficiently consider other factors that may also play a significant role, such as economic incentives, organizational culture, or regulatory frameworks. A more balanced discussion of these factors would strengthen the conclusion. o The conclusion repeats some ideas that were already discussed in detail earlier, such as the importance of updating knowledge on climate change. To avoid redundancy, these points could be more concisely summarized, with a greater emphasis on new insights or implications. 	
<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>This manuscript is both scientifically rigorous and technically sound. It uses advanced methods like beta regression and principal component analysis (PCA) to effectively analyze climate change mitigation behaviors (CCMB). By thoroughly examining how cognitive factors impact CCMB, the study provides valuable insights and reliable results. The careful methodology and detailed analysis strengthen the manuscript's credibility and its potential to contribute meaningfully to the field.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>No Suggestions</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>A native editor should edit the language of the paper.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>This article provides valuable insights into climate change mitigation behaviors (CCMB) among hotel managers in Naivasha Sub County, Kenya. The application of advanced statistical techniques like beta regression and principal component analysis (PCA) strengthens the validity of the study's findings. However, to further enhance the manuscript, it would benefit from clearer explanations of the statistical methods and a more focused presentation of the introduction and abstract. Simplifying these sections could make the research more approachable for a broader audience. Additionally, more detailed recommendations for practical applications and policy implications would improve the article's relevance and impact. Overall, this study is a significant contribution to the field, and addressing these suggestions could increase its clarity and effectiveness.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arezoo Salamatnia
Department, University & Country	Azad University, Iran