

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>Tourist industry contribute to the greenhouse gases emission from one hand, and is impacted by climate change (CC) from other hand, e.g. snow cover reduction influences ski resorts business. To involve tourist industry into CC mitigation activity, information on knowledge of hotel managers on climate change is needed. Also, their perception on importance of these issues and readiness to act could be used in preparation of CC mitigation programs on local and country level.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes.</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 needs revisions. Authors may want to exclude figures from the abstract. Readers look at the abstract at first, and they do not got acquainted yet with the research methods authors applied (some methods are beyond simple statistics), symbols meaning, and how these figures were obtained.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>'Data' section/sub-section is desirable, see the next entry.</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 style="text-align: center;">Major Revision is needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction contains incorrect statements. It is written: <i>Human activities are said to increase the amount of greenhouse gases (GHGs) such as carbon dioxide and methane in the upper atmosphere and to increased amounts of tiny particles (black carbon) in the lower atmosphere, trapping heat from the sun in this planet's atmosphere and thus keeping the earth warm.</i> CO₂ and CH₄ are distributed throughout the atmosphere in approximately the same volumetric mixture ratio. CO₂ and CH₄ do not trap heat from the sun. Their greenhouse function is to capture long-wave (infrared) radiation on the earth's surface and atmospheric layers. Authors may want to re-write this phrase and to add references, e.g. IPCC publications at www.ipcc.ch. It would be also useful to check and clarify other common statements in the Introduction, and to give appropriate references. • The authors may want to provide data used, i.e. the questions were asked, and managers' answers in the table form, or in another form. If the data are already published, provide a link. If not, the data/tables could be a part of a 'Data' sub-section under the 'Methods and Materials' section. Alternatively, these tables can be included into a Supplemental Material/Appendix.to the paper. • The paper would be significantly improved if authors provide all the information on how results are obtained in the FAIR mode, see below please. Describe all the steps, one by one. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Start from the data: describe all five grades of the Likert scale used, explain whether individual Likert items can be considered as interval-level data, or they should be treated as categorical data. If you treat them as interval-level data, explain why you presumed that intervals between values are equal. Describe and present all numerical and categorial data. If you use statistical packages, provide reference and explain why a procedure conditions are met. If you use a formula, write it (simple statistics could be exclusion). If you wrote code, provide it in the Supplemental Material/Appendix. 	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Introduction, common statements should be re-checked, and appropriate references provided. There are references in the text of the article, which do not correspond to anything in the 'References' section. A couple of examples: (Kumar et al., 2020) at p. 2, Gössling & Lund-Durlacher (2021) at p. 3. The reference 'World Tourism Organisation, & United Nations Environment Programme (2008)' repeated twice. The 'References' section should be re-checked carefully. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English is well understandable. However, careful editing by a native speaker is desirable. An example of typos: it is written likert scale instead of Likert scale.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirements for processing of scientific data were formulated more than 30 years ago and have been subsequently developed. They are currently known as FAIR Data Principles. That is, data should be Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable (e.g. (Wilkinson et al., 2016)). Authors may want to provide the data in full, and to re-write the paper on the way allowing reuse of the data. <p>Wilkinson M.D. et al. 2016. The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. – Scientific Data, 3: 160018. Doi: 10.1038/sdata.2016.18.</p> <p>In particular,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decipher the symbols and abbreviations used. Explain axis of the figures better. Tables 2, 3, 5 need more explanations on how they are obtained. There is no Table 4. Explain what asterisks in the Table 5 mean. 	

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>Gregory Insarov</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Institute of Geography of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia</p>