Review of: "Factors Influencing the Intention to Choose Transportation Applications in Bangkok, Thailand"

Nirajan Bam[1]

1 University of Northern Colorado

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The author's approach is commendable, with an engaging topic of study that is relatively unexplored. The abstract is well-written, though it should include details about the statistical techniques employed for data analysis. However, there is a need for substantial revisions before formal publication.

The introduction is somewhat limited, and some of the literature referenced are not directly relevant to the study. To strengthen the paper, the author should incorporate literature pertinent to their research. Additionally, in the introduction, the author reveals some of their findings, such as "In this study, perceived usefulness significantly impacts users' intentions,.." which could be revised or removed.

The data collection technique is clear, but it's worth noting that while the sample size was originally calculated using stratified random sampling, the author ultimately employed convenience sampling. There is also a lack of clarity regarding the statistical methods used for inferential analysis. Although the author used Cronbach's alpha to assess reliability, they did not address the questionnaire's validity. Furthermore, the paper only discusses the overall Cronbach's alpha, omitting information about the reliability of individual variables. In addition, a validity analysis is absent.

The paper lacks clear information about the data analysis techniques and does not provide descriptive details about the presented data. The specific inferential statistics used are unclear. If the author utilized multiple regression, it is essential to confirm whether they addressed all necessary assumptions and how they applied Likert scale items in the regression. If a different method was employed, there is no information available about it.

The discussion section is somewhat limited, and terms like "wild significant" are unclear and need clarification. The conclusion section, on the other hand, is well-presented.

Considering the overall quality of the paper, significant revisions are needed. The introduction requires revision, and the methodology section should be thoroughly presented and validated, particularly when using a quantitative approach. The discussion should provide a more detailed exploration of the findings and comparison with past studies. The paper, in its current form, lacks the compelling attributes required for publication.