

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

Moses Mwale¹

¹ University of Johannesburg

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Title

- The title is relevant to the content presented in the abstract, providing a concise summary of the study's primary focus

Abstract

- Overall, the abstract is well-written but could benefit from minor refinements for clarity and objectivity.
- The abstract is generally clear and offers a comprehensive overview of the study. However, the term "perceived efficiency" could benefit from further clarification.
- It would be good to give some examples of what these transport apps are and what is impact of these transport apps to travel behavior's of residents.
- The abstract states that a quantitative methodology was used and describes the primary data collection method, but it could be more specific about the statistical techniques employed.
- While the sample size is mentioned, it would be beneficial to briefly discuss the demographic characteristics of the sample for context.
- The abstract summarizes the findings succinctly. However, terms like "convincingly shown" might be perceived as subjective and could be replaced with more neutral language.
- The term "dynamic urban setting" could be considered redundant given the mention of "bustling urban environment" earlier. Consistency in terminology could enhance clarity.

1.0 Introduction

- Open with a crisp, well-crafted sentence that encapsulates the research question and its significance. Eliminate extraneous details to maintain focus.
- Clearly articulate what makes your research unique. Establish a "knowledge gap" that your study fills, positioning it as a must-read within the field.
- Move the statement of hypotheses closer to the beginning of the introduction. Clearly state what the study aims to achieve and why it matters.

2. Methodology

- The methodology is detailed in terms of its quantitative approach and the use of a Likert scale. While comprehensive,

the section could further highlight the rationale behind choosing a quantitative strategy over qualitative or mixed methods.

- Paragraph 1, "A five-point Likert Scale, ranging from 5 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree), was employed to assess the key variables." Consider specifying what these "key variables" are for clarity.
- The section refers to both "Stratified Random Sampling" and "convenience sampling," which may cause confusion. Clarify whether both methods were used, and if so, how they were integrated. Specify why convenience sampling was ultimately chosen.
- The discussion on sample size is adequate but could be strengthened by explaining why 400 participants were sufficient for achieving the study's objectives. Also, the criteria for inclusion and exclusion should be detailed.
- The use of Google Forms and social media platforms is mentioned, but consider elaborating on the advantages and limitations of these methods. This will help establish the reliability of your data collection process.
- It's good that a pre-test was conducted, but more information on what changes or adjustments were made following this phase could enhance the section.
- While the analytical software and types of statistics are noted, the specific statistical tests could be enumerated.
- The brief mention of ethical practices is important, but a more in-depth explanation would further strengthen the methodology.
- Although instrument validity is discussed, reliability is not mentioned. Including this aspect will round out the discussion on the robustness of the research tools.

3. Results

- The use of Cronbach's Alpha and R2 is adequately explained, but a deeper interpretation of these values could offer more insight.
- While the hypotheses are addressed, providing more context or even quoting the hypothesis statements might help to tie back to the original research questions.
- Strengthen the connection between the results and the methodology. Explain how the analytical methods utilized relate to the results observed.

4. Discussions

- The section does well to link the study's findings to existing literature, which adds credibility.
- The text successfully identifies the practical implications for app developers but might further discuss policy implications, given your interest in public health and road safety.
- The section covers multiple angles but may be enhanced by discussing any surprising or counterintuitive findings.

5. Conclusions

- The conclusions succinctly reiterate the main findings and their significance but could be enriched by explicitly outlining

contributions to the existing body of knowledge.

- You've well-articulated the limitations, which adds rigor. Consider also discussing the limitations in light of the methodology.
- Although you hint at future research areas, providing specific questions or directions can make this section more impactful.
- Your concluding remarks could include a call to action or recommendations for various stakeholders in transport and public health, aligning with your interests.