

The comments and suggestions from the editor and reviewers and the amended explanation from the authors.

Contents	Recommendation and Questions	Amendment
Academic Editor	(Revised1)	
1.)	The literature review needs to be expanded. The Author should provide an overview of where green MICE are today, certifications, etc.	Thank you very much for the recommendation to make our paper more clearly. We have already expanded and provided an overview of where green MICE are today, certifications, in page no.2, topic 2.1 Overview of Thailand's MICE industry: The challenges in realizing Sustainable Events development.
2.)	Change the order of the literature review; begin with an overview of event sustainability in the event industry; then, move on to address barriers and constraints.	Thank you very much for the recommendation to make our paper more clearly and stronger. We already changed the order of the literature review, in page no.2, topic 2. Literature review, line 1 until page no.4.
3.)	"The study used both qualitative and quantitative methods to gather and understanding of the holistic views". These are not the same groups of individuals, separate and identify numbers for each.	Thank you very much for the recommendation. We already separate and identify numbers for each information group to make our paper more clearly in page no.5, topic 3. Methodology, paragraph 1. "The study used both qualitative and quantitative methods to gather and understanding of the holistic views held by four stakeholders: 1) event participants/attendees, 2) venue Operator, 3) academic and 4) governmental policy makers.

The comments and suggestions from the editor and reviewers and the amended explanation from the authors (Cont.)

Contents	Recommendation and Questions	Amendment
4.)	Separate the number of people responding to survey questionnaires and the number of people responding to the qualitative interviews.	Thank you very much for the recommendation. We already separate the number of people responding to survey questionnaires to make our paper more clearly in page no.6, table 1. The number of people responding to survey questionnaires (N=500), and the number of people responding to the qualitative interviews, in page no.7, table 2. The number of people responding to the qualitative interviews.
5.)	Separate your methods into two sub-sections: survey questionnaire and qualitative.	Thank you very much for the recommendation to make our paper more clearly. We already separate the methods into two sub-sections: in page no.5, topic 3.1. Quantitative method – Survey questionnaires, and in page no.6, topic 3.2. Qualitative method – In-depth interview.
6.)	Add sub-heading “survey questionnaire” before diving into this section.	Thank you very much for the recommendation to make our paper more clearly. We already add sub-heading “survey questionnaire” in page no.5, topic 3.1. Quantitative method – Survey questionnaires, and in page no.6, topic 3.2. Qualitative method – In-depth interview.

The comments and suggestions from the editor and reviewers and the amended explanation from the authors (Cont.)

Contents	Recommendation and Questions	Amendment
7.)	There needs to be a clear justification for the two types of methodology utilized and how one informs the other, etc.	Thank you very much for the suggestions to make our paper more clearly. We have already revised and justification for the two types of the methodology utilized and how one informs the other in page no.5, topic 3. Methodology, paragraph 1, line 4. "The quantitative method allows the researcher to get the perspective attributes and practices of current event and event sustainability from participants/attendees perceptions and there identification of importance-performance factors. In addition the qualitative method was designed to deep understanding the perception of governmental, academics and venues towards the interviewees were asked to express their opinions and perspectives regarding barriers or problems that might effect of the sustainable development of the event industry in Thailand. They were also asked to suggest ways to overcome these barriers.
8.)	Questionnaire respondents - please describe differently.	Thank you very much for the recommendation to make our paper more clearly and stronger. We already changed "Questionnaire respondents" to "Individuals are responding to the survey questionnaire..." in page no.6, topic 3.2. Qualitative method – In-depth interview, paragraph 1, line 1.
9.)	I think you need to clarify your research questions above. I would add "perceived attributes" for research question 1	Thank you very much for the recommendation. We already add "perceived attributes" for research question 1, in page no.2, paragraph 4, line 5.

The comments and suggestions from the editor and reviewers and the amended explanation from the authors (Cont.)

Contents	Recommendation and Questions	Amendment
10.)	For research question 2, you should clarify perspectives on sustainability practices— what makes them common?	Thank you very much for the recommendation to make our paper more clearly and stronger. We already changed research question 2, to "Understand the importance implemented sustainability practices and policies in MICE industry". The whole research design from this part especially qualitative method gave researcher to the understanding of the implemented sustainability practices and policies in MICE industry from governmental, academic and venue.
11.)	In the results section, please add quotes from the experts to highlight the dimensions of your findings.	<p>Thank you very much for your recommendation, we have already add quotes from the experts to highlight the dimensions, as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In page no.10, paragraph 3, line 2. 2. In page no.11, paragraph 1, line 9. 3. In page no.12, paragraph 2, line 8. 4. In page no.13, paragraph 1, line 16. 5. In page no.15, paragraph 2, line 1. 6. In page no.16, paragraph 4, line 8.

The comments and suggestions from the editor and reviewers and the amended explanation from the authors (Cont.)

Contents	Recommendation and Questions	Amendment
Academic Editor	(Revised2)	
1.)	<p>Page 2</p> <p>Not sure what is meant by this statement, this is not true globally or add proof--this is not always the case.</p> <p><i>At present, each local community or country has shifted their focus to organizing special events to stimulate the local or national economy.</i></p>	<p>Thank you very much for the recommendation to make our paper more clearly. We have already deleted the paragraph from the article.</p>
2.)	<p>Page 2</p> <p>This para really does nothing to strengthen the introduction, it has more than one idea and is not written in a way that informs the reader of the point.</p> <p><i>Mostly, organizing these events encourage external attendees to travel to the area and generate income for the local community. That means the local community will be developed in many aspects, including more community income or new businesses. Most people tend to think of environmental impact as being negative .[11]</i></p>	<p>Thank you very much for the recommendation to make our paper more clearly and stronger. We have already deleted the paragraph from the article.</p>

The comments and suggestions from the academic editor and the amended explanation from the authors (Cont.)

Contents	Recommendation and Questions	Amendment
3.)	Page 2 This may be a stronger opening paragraph	Thank you very much for the recommendation. We have already deleted the previous paragraph from the article.
4.)	Page 2 This is not an overview of certification, it is one level of management only What about the certification programs for specifically MICE? There are a few out there... <i>ISO 20121 certification is one of implementing sustainable practices to management system standard that has been designed to help organizations in the events industry improves the sustainability.</i>	Thank you very much for the recommendation. We already add the relevant certification scheme and standard of green meeting in page No.3, Paragraph 1. The ISO 20121 event management standard also gave the foundation of green meeting certification in Thailand.

The comments and suggestions from the editor and reviewers and the amended explanation from the authors (Cont.)

Contents	Recommendation and Questions	Amendment
5.)	<p>Page 3</p> <p>Re-write, does not make sense</p> <p><i>This becomes more of a surprise when considering that there is existing evidence that consumer decisions are influenced by environmental concerns.</i></p>	<p>Thank you very much for the recommendation to make our paper more clearly. We already amend the sentence as follow:</p> <p>There is few evidence to support the argument that consumer decisions are influenced by environmental concerns.</p>
6.)	<p>Page 4</p> <p>Edit the paragraph according to the editor suggestion.</p> <p><i>The study used both qualitative and quantitative methods to gather and understanding of the viewpoint by four stakeholders: 1) governmental policy maker, 2) academica , 3) venue and 4) participants/attendees. The quantitative method allows the researcher to get the perspective attributes and practices of current event and event sustainability from participants/attendees perceptions and their identification of importance-performance factors.</i></p>	<p>Thank you very much for the suggestions to make our paper more clearly. We have already revised accordingly as follow:</p> <p>The study used both qualitative and quantitative methods to gather and understanding of the viewpoint of four groups of stakeholders: 1) governmental policy maker, 2) academia, 3) venue and 4) participants/attendees. The quantitative method allows researchers to understand the practices of current event and event sustainability perspective of participants/attendees and their identification of importance-performance factors.</p>

The comments and suggestions from the editor and reviewers and the amended explanation from the authors (Cont.)

Contents	Recommendation and Questions	Amendment
7.)	<p>Page 5</p> <p>Edit the paragraph according to the editor suggestion.</p> <p><i>The questionnaire design was followed green meeting standard from Thailand Environment Institute (TEI) and event sustainability guideline from Thailand Convention and Exhibition Bureau (TCEB).</i></p>	<p>Thank you very much for the recommendation to make our paper more clearly and stronger. We already revised accordingly as follow:</p> <p>The questionnaire design was modeled after the green meetings standard from the Thailand Environment Institute (TEI) and event sustainability guideline from Thailand Convention and Exhibition Bureau (TCEB).</p>
8.)	<p>Page 6</p> <p>Edit the sub-heading according to the editor suggestion.</p> <p><i>3.2. Qualitative method – In-depth interviews</i></p>	<p>Thank you very much for the recommendation. We already add s at the end of 3.2 sub-heading.</p>

The comments and suggestions from the editor and reviewers and the amended explanation from the authors (Cont.)

Contents	Recommendation and Questions	Amendment
9.)	<p>Page 6</p> <p>Not sure what is going on here</p> <p>Qualitative data, content analysis was employed to contextualize the connections between categories and themes. Tables were constructed to identify the themes and evolving concepts with the aid of Microsoft Excel computer software. Content analysis is considered an appropriate research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts on the contexts of their use, and it provides new insights by increasing the researcher's ability to understand particular phenomena or informing them on practical actions [40]. After the collection of primary and secondary data, which took place from July to September, 2015, all information was summarized and then discussed with two scholars specializing in the MICE industry in an effort to put the information in context in terms of its relevance and importance to the industry</p>	<p>Thank you very much for the notice of the paper format. We have already made amendment accordingly.</p>

The comments and suggestions from the editor and reviewers and the amended explanation from the authors (Cont.)

Contents	Recommendation and Questions	Amendment
Reviewer 1	(Revised1)	
1.)	<p>The topic is unclear, the definition of “effective attributes” of event sustainability are unclear.</p> <p>The four attributes listed in the Research framework lacking of structural characteristics didn’t closely related to the subsequent research design</p>	<p>Thank you very much for the recommendation to make our paper more clearly and stronger, as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) We have already changed the title of the article to “Perceived attributes of MICE sustainability in Thailand: A viewpoint from governmental, academic, venue and practitioner”, in page no.1, 2.) We have already revised research framework by through two perspectives of environmental development and institution development of event sustainability, in page no.7, Figure1. Research framework.
2.)	<p>The core essential of “sustainability” research is the balance of pluralistic values. It is necessary for the practical significance of “sustainability” knowledge to discuss the problems and countermeasures in the specific political and economic context.</p>	<p>This research try’s to exam the current developing stage of event sustainability in Thailand from the viewpoints of main stakeholder: 1) governmental, 2) academic, 3) venue and 4) participants/attendees. It also suggests a future policy and strategies to improve the event sustainability in Thailand. The sustainability knowledge needs to have future implementation and promotion in Thai MICE industry. From the research result, this concern has made in page no.20 paragraph 4, line 1.</p>

The comments and suggestions from the editor and reviewers and the amended explanation from the authors (Cont.)

Contents	Recommendation and Questions	Amendment
3.)	The lack of relevance of its quantitative research and qualitative research is difficult to confirm the necessity of mixing methodology, nor does it produce systematic and structural questions and answers, and then presents a systematic description of sustainable problems and policy recommendations.	<p>Thank you very much for the suggestions to make our paper more clearly. We already revised and justification for the two types of the methodology utilized and how one informs the other in page no.5, topic 3.1. Quantitative method – Survey questionnaires, paragraph 1, line 4. “The questionnaire design was followed green meeting standard from Thailand Environment Institute (TEI) and event sustainability guideline from Thailand Convention and Exhibition Bureau (TCEB), to identify the perception of sustainable event development in Thailand”.</p> <p>In page no.7, topic 3.2. Qualitative method – In-depth interview, paragraph 1, line 6. The interview schedule was designed to understand the perception of government, academics and venues towards the interviewees were asked to express their opinions and perspectives regarding barriers or problems that might effect of the sustainable development of the event industry in Thailand.</p>

The comments and suggestions from the editor and reviewers and the amended explanation from the authors. (Cont.)

Contents	Recommendation and Questions	Amendment
4.)	The policy institution of sustainability involves several important features such as policy integration, policy innovation and policy autonomy, but the study didn't fully touch it.	Thank you very much for the suggestions to make our paper clearly and stronger. Our research objective is to understand from governmental, academic, venue and practitioner; try to find the current state of MICE sustainability in Thailand, in term of policy, strategy, and development issue. The event sustainability policy in Thailand still in the stage of knowing and awarding the importance of the policy. It is not yet forming a comprehensive government policy to promote the event sustainability, let alone the policy integration, policy innovation and policy autonomy. The research findings the lack of well-designed event sustainability policy to implement. It is to suggest Thai government should take full repressively to promote event sustainability as this is an importance strategy to give competition advantages for Thai MICE industry.

The comments and suggestions from the editor and reviewers and the amended explanation from the authors (Cont.)

Contents	Recommendation and Questions	Amendment
5.)	<p>The research is not rigorous enough. Ex. In part of "Perceived importance of criteria in creating event sustainability", in the response of respondents of the questionnaire presented in the 27 criteria of sustainable, mean concentrated in the 3.47 to 3.92 between. This shows that the identification of the questionnaire design is not enough to measure the attitude of the respondents; in another part of "Importance - performance analysis", the two-axis scale in Figure 2, Figure 3 should be shown in accord with the questionnaire scale of 1-5. And then we will clearly see the comprehensive cognitive position of the importance- performance analysis of these 27 criteria in the quadrant coordinates is quite concentrated, leading to the relatively weak value for reference in this part research.</p>	<p>Thank you very much for the suggestions to make our paper clearly and stronger. In the part of perceived importance of criteria in creating event sustainability. The questionnaire was developed according with green meeting standard from Thailand Environment Institute (TEI) and event sustainability guideline from Thailand Convention and Exhibition Bureau (TCEB). The main score shows the participant has a similar perception of the importance of event sustainability criteria. This indicates the necessity of further promotion and education of event sustainability. The qualitative research in this study also shows the need for future training in event sustainability strategies.</p> <p>In another part of Importance - performance analysis (IPA). The researcher follows the pattern of the IPA diagram, to give a closer visualization, and to make it more clearly, we also add the summary paragraph in page no.15, paragraph 2, line 1.</p>

The comments and suggestions from the editor and reviewers and the amended explanation from the authors (Cont.)

Contents	Recommendation and Questions	Amendment
Reviewer 1	(Revised2)	
1.)	The authors' amendment has made the topic, methodology and contribution of this paper clearer. It'll be helpful to understand the current state of MICE sustainability in Thailand, in term of policy, strategy, and development issues. It also offers a quite valuable reference for different stakeholders in Thailand.	Thank you very much for the recommendation to make our paper more clearly. We have already made amendment accordingly. In page No.5, The topic of methodology.

The comments and suggestions from the editor and reviewers and the amended explanation from the authors (Cont.)

Contents	Recommendation and Questions	Amendment
Reviewer 2	(Revised1)	
1.)	In the literature review. One of your charts did not appear so it was difficult to comment on one results section.	Thank you very much for the suggestions to make our paper clearly and stronger. We have already revised the literature review and changed the order of the literature review according to editor's comment, in page no.2, topic 2. Literature review.

The comments and suggestions from the editor and reviewers and the amended explanation from the authors (Cont.)

Contents	Recommendation and Questions	Amendment
Reviewer 3	(Revised1)	
1.)	Change the title. I would put a reference to MICE and try to synthesize it.	Thank you very much for the recommendation to make our paper more clearly and stronger, We have already changed the title of the article to "Perceived attributes of event sustainability in the MICE industry in Thailand: A viewpoint from governmental, academic, venue and practitioner", in page no.1.
2.)	Move tables 1 and 2 from the paragraph "Result" to an "Appendix", in the end of the paper.	Thank you very much for the recommendation to make our paper more clearly and stronger. The table 1 and table 2 show the background and the representative. It is important to explain and make the reader more understanding.