Dear reviewer,
We are pleased to submit the revised version of the paper entitled 'The Human Circular Tourism as the tourism of tomorrow: the role of travellers for achieving a more sustainable and circular tourism'.

We would like to express our appreciation for the useful comments provided. We have carefully revised the manuscript to improve it according to your recommendations.

Detailed responses to all individual comments are provided in the table below. We have written in red the changes and additions made to the paper based on the different review reports we received (excluding the parts that we eliminated and therefore did not report in the paper).

We also added the pdf version in case the layout of the images was lost.

Thank you for your comments and stimulating suggestions.
We look forward to hearing from you.
Best regards

Reviewer's comments	**Authors' answers**
Abstract	
I propose to correct the abstract according to the Journal "Sustainability". There is no information about the methods used and the results of the study are not presented.	Thank you for this suggestion. We have modified the abstract according to your recommendation.
Title	
Title of the work should be modified. It lacks reference to the area of research. The content of the article does not fully correspond to the title of the paper.	Based on your suggestion, the title of paper has been modified as follows "The Human Circular Tourism as the tourism of tomorrow: the role of travellers for achieving a more sustainable and circular tourism", better explaining the research field and the content of the paper.
Structure of Article	
I suggest improving the structure of the article according to the guidelines of the journal. New chapter numbering should be introduced 1. Introduction 2. Literature review/Theoretical background 3. Materials and Methods 4. Results 5. Discussion The introduction to the topic is interesting and based on world literature.	Thank you for your suggestion which we greatly appreciated. Indeed, reorganized in this way the paper is much more well structured and clear.
At the end of this chapter, the purpose of the paper should be stated. The paper does not ask detailed research questions.	Thank you for this recommendation. We have made the objective of our research more explicit.

[101-109] - this information is redundant, does not contribute anything	This part is intended to provide the readers a brief summary about the structure of the paper and the content of the following paragraphs in order to "prepare" the readers and thus make the reading easier. Other reviewers have advised us to keep this part. So, we preferred and considered it more appropriate to kept it and, as you suggested, we have better clarified the research goals.
Literature review/theoretical background	
The following chapters are too much [110-435]. Please select the content in terms of the topic of the paper.	Thank you for this suggestion. We have summarized this paragraph.
[191]- in this line appears information about the purpose of the article "In this paper, the circular tourism model is proposed as a model for making tourism more sustainable, capable of producing environmental, social and economic benefits at the same time".	Thank you for this suggestion. This line was moved and integrated at the end of introduction.
Materials and Methods	
[445]- the next purpose of the work is given: "In this study, a survey has been conducted involving community through interviews aiming at understanding their awareness about sustainable and circular tourism, their behaviours as tourists and the influence of the COVID-19 on their traveller's choices."	Thank you for this comment. We did not want to add an additional goal, but to better explain what was stated earlier. However, we have reorganized the paper and explained more clearly the objective of our paper, avoiding ambiguity.
In order to better understand the purpose of the work, I suggest to introduce a scheme of research procedure.	Thank you for this suggestion. We have developed and included a diagram to make the research procedure clearer.
Results	
The results were presented and described in a good way, they are very interesting and important for the development of sustainable tourism. However, I would suggest doing some organizing of the obtained results in the form of tables. The text needs to be clear and easy to read.	Thank you for this helpful suggestion. At the beginning of each section of the questionnaire, a synthetic table, showing the results of that section, was included to summarize and better communicate the results. The text has been revised and edited for making it clearer and more comprehensible.
Discussion	

In the Discussion section, the authors should discuss and explain the conclusions and results of the work more. The authors should compare their project and results with the results of similar ongoing research on this topic from other parts of Europe and around the world.	Thank you for this suggestion. The discussion section was integrated with more comprehensive reflections and also with comparative information about other international projects or researches.
This section should still answer the question: what tangible benefits has this study brought to the development of sustainable tourism?	Thank you for your comment. We have reorganised the entire discussion section by integrating the survey results with further reflections and indications on future perspectives for the tourism sector. This process allowed us to highlight the contribution of the Human Circular Tourism (HCT) as a strategy to achieve a more sustainable future and thus to solve critical aspects identified in the actual tourism model and confirmed by the survey.