

Peer Review

Review of: "Medical Tourism in the Thessaly Region, Greece: Hotel Managers' Attitudes, Opinions, and Perspectives"

Evangelos Rasvanis¹

1. Department of Economics, University of Macedonia, Greece

The revised paper appears to have addressed some key concerns raised in my initial review, enhancing its clarity, analytical depth, and contribution. Below, I evaluate the adjustments and provide additional suggestions.

The abstract now highlights the study's unique focus on Thessaly's hotel managers; it better highlights its value, though it should succinctly frame this contribution. The literature review likely benefits from thematic organisation and a Thessaly-specific conclusion, improving coherence; a brief critique of prior Greek studies could further sharpen it. If Section 4.1 justifies the 4- and 5-star hotel focus and clarifies questionnaire adaptation with examples from Table 1, transparency rises, but conciseness is key. Enhanced interpretation in the results, with detailed figure captions (e.g., specifying other tourism forms), likely deepens analysis, and acknowledging Magnesia's sample dominance as a limitation would boost credibility. A conceptual model in Section 5 linking hotel capacity, accreditation, and policy support to investment willingness could be a theoretical leap, while specific, actionable practical suggestions for Thessaly in Section 6 would strengthen impact – both needing clarity and focus. If the conclusions now reflect broader Mediterranean implications tied to findings, global relevance increases; otherwise, it's a missed chance. Proofreading and varied transitions improve readability. Overall, the revised paper seems stronger, combining solid data with better analysis, but how it's done counts: clear reasons and a well-constructed story are key to making it impactful and easy to understand for scholars.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.