



Manuscript Title:	Navigating Risks and Constraints: The Role of Destination Image in Empowering Women Travelers
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The reviewers acknowledge the potential of the manuscript and recommend several revisions to further enhance its clarity, organization, and overall scholarly contribution. The authors are advised to carefully address all comments and suggestions provided by the reviewers in preparing the revised version of the manuscript.

Reviewer 1

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
I read your manuscript with much interest because the topic on women travelers in the Philippines is very relevant and timely for tourism development. Overall the work is good, it shows important findings about resilience of young women in Davao and the strong role of destination image, which can really help local tourism. The abstract and conclusion are clear and the use of theories like Prospect Theory and Theory of Planned Behavior is nice. But to make the paper stronger for publication, I think there are some parts that need attention so the claims become more solid and convincing.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
One big concern is the missing descriptive results for destination image. You gave nice tables with means and SD for expected risks, travel constraints and visit intention, and even interpreted them as neutral, low and high. But there is no table or mean score at all for destination image, even though it is the central mediator and you say in abstract it plays key role. Readers need to know the level of this variable too, like is it high or neutral, so the story is complete. Perhaps you can add one more table in results section 3 with the same format as Table 2 and 3, this will help a lot and make findings balanced.
Another main issue is the mediation analysis. You used simple linear regression and showed only direct effects after putting destination image in the model, and concluded no mediation. But this is not enough for proper mediation test. From your correlation Table 5, risks and constraints already have almost zero relation with image, so path a is not there, but you did not report all paths clearly or use bootstrap or Sobel test to confirm indirect effect is really zero. In quantitative mediation studies, especially for journal like this, it is better to show full model with



a, b, c and c' paths and explain the method step by step. This will make your claim no mediation much stronger and avoid any doubt from readers.

Also I see some confusion on the focus of the study. The respondents are women from Davao City who answered about a particular place they thought of visiting, so the destination image and intention are general, not about Davao itself. But in discussion and conclusion you recommend to Davao Tourism Operations Office and DOT to promote safety certifications for the city. This mismatch may confuse people. Maybe clarify in methodology or discussion that findings apply to how local women decide on any destination, or if possible adjust implications to help incoming tourists to Davao. It will make the practical suggestions fit better.

The population and sampling also need clearer explanation. You said 1,266,734 female travelers in Davao from May 2024 to August 2025 as basis for sample size 385 with Rasoft calculator. But this number looks very high for only four months in one city, and since you used purposive sampling it is not probability sampling so the formula may not fit well. Perhaps check the exact figure from Tourism Office again or explain why purposive still gives good representation. This small change will remove any question on how representative the sample is.

Finally, you mentioned pilot test and Cronbach Alpha for reliability and validity of the questionnaire, but no actual alpha values are reported anywhere. For a quantitative paper it is important to show these numbers for each scale so we know the instrument is reliable. Just add them in section 2.3 or in a small table, it will strengthen the methodology a lot.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

Reviewer 2

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. The authors are commended for tackling a very timely and relevant topic, particularly in understanding the travel behaviors of young female tourists in the local context of Davao City. The objective of exploring destination image, expected risks, and travel constraints is highly appreciable.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The study intends to test the mediating role of destination image. However, your Pearson r results show that Expected Risks ($p = 0.519$) and Travel Constraints ($p = 0.130$) have no significant relationship with Visit Intention. In standard statistical practice, an initial significant relationship between the independent and dependent variables must exist to be mediated.



Since you found no relationship to mediate, presenting Tables 7 and 8 as "Direct vs. Indirect Effect" is conceptually flawed. It is highly suggested to restructure the paper. Instead of a mediation model, frame the study as an assessment of multiple predictors (Risks, Constraints, and Destination Image) on Visit Intention. You can use multiple regression analysis to show that when all variables are accounted for, Destination Image is the sole significant driver. This aligns perfectly with your conclusion that destination image is a powerful independent variable.

In Section 2.2, the manuscript states that a sample size of 385 was computed using the Raosoft calculator based on a population of 1,266,734. Please note that sample size calculators like Raosoft are designed for probability random sampling. However, you explicitly stated that you used purposive sampling, which is a non-probability technique. You cannot use a probability-based formula to justify a purposive sample.

In Section 2.6 under "Qualification of Researchers," the manuscript states: "The researchers were fourth year students in the Bachelor of Science in tourism management course...". Please remove this statement. A manuscript submitted to a double-blind peer-reviewed journal should not reveal the identities, academic level, or specific institution of the authors in the main text to maintain objectivity. The ethical clearance and institutional approval mentioned in Section 2.4 are sufficient to establish the study's ethical compliance.

The discussion attempts to connect the findings to Prospect Theory and Constraints Theory. However, stating that low travel constraints are related to confidence and independence which opposes the idea of restriction is a bit of a leap. If the constraints are inherently perceived as low by your demographic (e.g., they don't actually experience much peer discouragement or lack of information), it simply means the barriers aren't there, rather than the women actively redefining obstacles. Ground the discussion more closely to the actual data. Since your respondents are young (18-30 years old), focus the discussion on how this specific demographic's access to digital information and modern societal shifts in the Philippines make them view travel risks neutrally and constraints lowly.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.



SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer 1</u>	<u>Reviewer 2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			