Review of: "Assessing International Tourist Satisfaction in Phu Quoc: Recommendations for Sustainable Ecological Economic Development"

Mohammad Reza Fathi[1]

1 University of Tehran, Iran, Islamic Republic of

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. Introduction

Weaknesses:

- **Lack of a Conceptual Framework and Research Questions:** The introduction does not provide a clear framework for the research questions. This leads to confusion about the study's objectives and direction.
- **Absence of Novelty:** There is no explicit mention of innovation or research gaps. The author fails to differentiate this study from previous similar research.
- **Insufficient Documentation:** The background focuses on general development programs and the importance of the island but lacks in-depth discussion to establish the research problem.

2. Literature Review

Weaknesses:

- **Outdated References:** A significant portion of the references is more than eight years old. For a topic like sustainable tourism, more recent and relevant literature is necessary to ensure credibility and relevance.
- **Superficial Coverage:** The literature review does not delve deeply into critical components like destination image, natural environment, and infrastructure. These elements are central to the study but are insufficiently reviewed.
- **Research Gap and Hypotheses:** The literature review does not explicitly highlight gaps or propose hypotheses, leaving the study's purpose ambiguous.

3. Methodology

Weaknesses:

- **Outdated Data Collection:** The data were collected five years ago (January 2019), which raises concerns about the current relevance of the findings in the dynamic tourism sector.
- **Sampling Issues:** The sampling technique is not clarified (e.g., random or convenience sampling). Additionally, there

is no justification for the sample size of 196 respondents.

- **Measurement and Variables:** The article lacks information on the specific variables, their measurement, and the scales used in the questionnaire.
- **Data Analysis Techniques:** The methodology does not address how hypotheses are tested or how the statistical tools align with the study's objectives.

4. Results

Weaknesses:

- **Ambiguity in Variable Presentation:** The results section does not clearly explain which variables were measured and how these align with the research objectives.
- **Regression Analysis:** While regression analysis is presented, the interpretation lacks depth. The importance of the factors identified (e.g., price and value) is downplayed without sufficient reasoning.
- **Reliance on Descriptive Statistics:** The analysis heavily relies on descriptive statistics and exploratory factor analysis but does not effectively utilize inferential statistics to test hypotheses.

5. Discussion

Weaknesses:

- **Lack of Theoretical Integration:** The discussion fails to link findings to existing theories or models, leaving the reader without a broader understanding of the implications.
- **Superficial Comparisons:** There is limited comparison with previous studies, which undermines the credibility of the findings and their generalizability.
- **No Hypothesis-Based Discussion:** The discussion is not structured around hypotheses, which weakens the study's logical flow.

6. Conclusion

Weaknesses:

- **Generalized Summary:** The conclusion reiterates findings without emphasizing their significance or implications.
- **Missed Opportunities for Future Research:** Although future research directions are mentioned, they are generic and lack specificity.
- **Insufficient Practical Recommendations:** The proposed ecological economic model is vague and lacks actionable details for stakeholders.

Quantitative Analysis-Specific Criticisms

- **Sample Size:** The sample size (196 respondents) is small, particularly for a study that aims to generalize findings to a broader population. This raises questions about the statistical power of the results.
- **Model Fit and Validation:** While regression analysis was performed, there is no mention of model validation or testing for multicollinearity issues.
- **Over-Reliance on SERVPERF:** While the SERVPERF model is suitable, the article does not discuss alternative approaches or justify why SERVPERF is the best fit for this study.