

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

Zdravko Sergo¹

¹ Institut za poljoprivredu i turizam Porec

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This manuscript aims to examine Austrian economic analysis in relation to failures and paradoxes in the digitization of the Spanish tourism industry. Although the topic is interesting, the manuscript suffers from several shortcomings in terms of focus, clarity, structure, and others.

1. The title contains two topics and the manuscript lacks the "Austrian economic analysis" that the paper promises in terms of focus and clarity. Instead, the former term is linked to the New-Institutional Approaches. Or, the old economic doctrine is coloured with newer ideas.
2. Abstract: It contains too many unclear terms, which are treated in particular detail later in the manuscript, such as "genetic-causal analysis according to the Austrian School of National Economics, linked to the New-Institutional Approaches." I have assumed that various ideas summarized later in the paper will receive theoretical verification in the earlier synthesis. However, this is not always the case.
3. The paper suffers from lack of balance structure; the presented overview of theoretical and conceptual contributions as the author in his great ambition insert in his manuscript started in the past economic schools, were, it seems to me, labourious. Perhaps, even superfluous. Thus, the promising theme that we see from the title "Failures and paradoxes in the digitalization of the Spanish tourism industry" at the end of the paper, despite the previous extended underpinning of the historical findings, when it comes to the (different) school of economics point of view, is very short in content.
4. Introduction: there is a lack of motivation for this work, what is the research problem, what is the goal and objective of this research, what is the novelty and contribution of this manuscript.
5. "This study aims to refute the postulates that technological progress is destroying jobs, because digital transformation is not destroying as many jobs as originally predicted." (Here, as in many other sentences, the relevant references are missing. I am not so sure AI technology would not replace a bunch of semi-skilled and even skilled jobs in the tourism sector in 10 years, maybe less)??!
6. The main part of the manuscript: It is difficult to understand what the author wants to tell the reader. The author uses some new compounds (emprosumer, glocal). You have unnecessary illustrations in your manuscript (Figure 4. (sourced from: Garrison, 2001) & Figure 5. Formulation and graphical representation of Ricardo effect (readaptation). Source: author's elaboration, but written in Spanish). It has nothing to do with the tourism industry. I do not see the

point: there is a lack of focus, the flow of thought is often unclear, there is a lack of explanation of the significance and potential impact on the labour situation in tourism.

7. Conclusions: What are the main findings, messages and contribution of this manuscript?
8. References: The number of references is rather limited with respect to more current literature contributions on the subject.
9. Finally, the manuscript needs considerable revision and English proofreading.