

# Review of: "Austrian Economics Analysis for Failures and Paradoxes in the Digitalization of the Spanish Tourism Industry"

Hugo Pinto<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidade de Coimbra

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is an ambitious effort and a potentially interesting paper. However, in its present form it is still at a very draft stage and is in need of significant revision in order to be acceptable for publication.

In my view, the paper suffers from three gigantic flaws.

The first is the disconnect between the 'promise' of the article and what is actually done. The title of the article promises to use Austrian economics to analyze the digitalization of the Spanish tourism industry. This is not done. The article is mainly a literature review, very broad, that at best uses this empirical sectoral case to highlight some aspects of the limitations of the theories reviewed.

The second is the structure, with many errors of logical sequence, with very long sentences and almost no paragraphs.

This is compounded by the third flaw. It mixes an excessive number of frameworks, ideas, concepts, theories that make the narrative and the argument of the text very difficult to follow.

Specific questions:

- The title is not clear enough.
- The article begins by saying that this review is different from similar articles in mainstream economics. It is not clear how. Clarify.
- On page 2, Introduction, the author emphasizes that globalization and digitalization are key drivers in today's reality. These phenomena need to be at least minimally explained, and their understanding should not be taken for granted.
- Figures need to be revised. The first problem is that many figures (1, 2, 3) are not figures but tables. These are not well formatted, even with grammatical errors marked (they appear to be a print screen of a Word file).
- I do not think the content of figure 1 is relevant as a figure/table. It should be included in the text.
- The study mentions that it aims to refute the mainstream postulates that are contrary to technological progress. These postulates must be clearly identified - with the main authors who hold this negative perspective and who the author wishes

to challenge.

- The titles of sections and subsections need to be improved to be more descriptive.
- Check acronyms, e.g. the first time an acronym appears in the text it should be accompanied by the full description, followed by the acronym in brackets (e.g. "EU").
- For the sake of clarity, the literature review needs to be divided into subsections. As I understand it, there is a subsection 2.1. with a brief "overview of theoretical controversies and mainstream economics" and a subsection 2.2. on "digitalization" (pages 5 and 6). These are quite unbalanced in size, so this also deserves revision. Perhaps Part 3 is also a literature review (a new 2.3).
- Figure 2 should be changed to an actual figure.
- I think section 3 on paradigmatic swifts would benefit from reading Carlota Perez's and Freeman's and Louçã's contributions on techno-economic paradigms.
- On page 8, the author mentions "empirical evidence seems to indicate..." but no actual references are used to illustrate this. Please add these.
- Figures 4 and 5 need better explanation in the text.
- Figure 5 is partly in Spanish.
- The title of section 4 does not match the content. More precision is needed. Suggestion "An empirical illustration using the case of European and Spanish industry". As it stands, it seems to provide an overview of this particular industry, which is not the case.
- There are two assumptions that deserve more discussion/clarification. I personally disagree with them. Assumption 1, that the tourism industry is not supported by the ESIF. I can understand the authors' point of view, but some reference, for example with the actual investments by sector or economic activity, in Europe and/or Spain, is crucial to substantiate this assertion. Secondly, assumption 2, that EU policies, such as the *Recovery and Resilience Facility (RRF)*, are centralized instruments. As I see it, it is quite decentralised, in the member states and in the different regions, in many cases even place-based.

Good luck!