Evaluation of the Impact of Tourism Flows on the Urban Food Service Industry. A Sensitivity Analysis on the City of Rome

Giovanna Acampa[1], Alessio Pino[2], and Alberto Pino[3(✉)]

[1] University of Florence, Via P.A. Micheli 2, 50129 Florence, Italy
[2] University of Enna "Kore", Cittadella Universitaria, 94100 Enna, Italy
[3] Sapienza University of Rome, Via del Castro Laurenziano 9, 00161 Rome, Italy
albertopinonicolella@gmail.com

Abstract. Following the end of the pandemic in 2022, habits regarding leisure, tourism, and dining have been subjected to several changes and oscillations. As proven by several sources, such as the FIPE report and the ISFORT report on citizens' expenses, dining out has become slightly more frequent for residents. At the same time, tourist flows have increased, reaching new records for several European cities, especially in Italy. This latter phenomenon appears to be predominant compared to the former. This variation of flows has also produced variations in urban morphology, with a marked increase in the number of restaurants, especially with an increase in the number of restaurants, yet dependent on tourism oscillations.

By focusing on the city of Rome, this paper evaluates the dependency of the food service industry on tourist flows: this is performed through a quantitative survey of the number and typology of restaurants, a financial analysis to assess the economic flows related to tourism, a break-even analysis to determine the inflection points of this phenomenon, and finally the simulation of decreasing tourism scenarios – made realistic by the current geopolitical situation – complemented by a sensitivity analysis. A 5% tourism drop results in a loss of ~16.5 million meals annually, pushing 450–600 additional restaurants below BEP, while a 10% decline results in 33 million lost meals, increasing failures to 900–1,200 businesses. The historical center is the most vulnerable, potentially losing up to 600 restaurants, while peripheral areas are less affected due to their reliance on local customers.

Keywords: evaluation · sensitivity analysis · food service industry

1 Introduction

In the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic, the global tourism and hospitality sectors have entered a phase of accelerated transformation [1]. Following the severe contraction of international mobility in 2020 and 2021, the industry rebounded sharply: according to the United Nations World Tourism Organization [2], international tourist arrivals grew by 30% in 2023 compared to the previous year, with several countries exceeding

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2026
O. Gervasi et al. (Eds.): ICCSA 2025 Workshops, LNCS 15891, pp. 107–121, 2026.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-97617-9_8

pre-pandemic levels. Italy, in particular, has reasserted its centrality as a global tourist destination, registering over 440 million overnight stays in 2023, a 6.5% increase over 2019 figures. Cities like Rome, Florence, and Venice have seen the return of mass tourism, often referred to as "over-tourism", with visible impacts on urban space, local services, and economic structures [3].

One of the most significantly affected sectors is the food service industry, which has responded to increased tourist flows with a marked proliferation of restaurants, especially in urban historic centers [4]. This dynamic is coupled with evolving local consumption patterns. As reported by the 2023 FIPE and ISFORT reports, Italians are dining out more frequently, particularly in metropolitan contexts such as Rome, where residents consume an estimated 160 meals per year outside the home [5] – 30% higher than the national average. Nevertheless, while local and international consumption is growing, tourism is the predominant force shaping the current urban food economy [6].

This increased reliance on fluctuating tourist flows introduces new vulnerabilities into the urban restaurant ecosystem. Restaurants, particularly those in highly touristic areas, have structured their business models around international demand, raising concerns about financial resilience [7]. External shocks – such as geopolitical crises, changes in visa policy, or future pandemics – could reduce visitor flows and threaten business sustainability. Yet, the financial equilibrium of the restaurant sector is rarely examined in direct relation to its dependency on tourism [8].

This study focuses on Rome as a case study to investigate the structural dependency of the urban restaurant sector on tourism. Through a mixed-method approach involving a quantitative survey of the number and typology of restaurants, a financial analysis and break-even model, and a sensitivity analysis simulating a 5% and 10% drop in tourist flows, the paper seeks to answer the following research question: "to what extent is the economic viability of restaurants in Rome dependent on tourism flows, and what are the potential consequences of moderate declines in international visitors?".

The findings aim to inform not only academic debates on urban tourism and service economies but also policy strategies for urban resilience and sectoral support. Indeed, preliminary evaluations in such a complex context are always crucial and required to make decisions in urban regeneration [9].

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Break-Even Analysis

Break-even analysis is a fundamental instrument in managerial accounting and operational planning, used to determine the level of output or sales at which total revenues equal total costs. It identifies the point at which an enterprise shifts from loss to profit, thereby offering a quantitative basis for evaluating financial sustainability [10]. The origins of break-even analysis lie in early 20th-century cost-volume-profit (CVP) modeling, which remains foundational in assessing business feasibility under varying economic conditions [11].

The basic formulation of the break-even point (BEP) can be expressed as [12]:

$$BEP = \frac{F}{P - V} \tag{1}$$

where:

- BEP = Break-Even Point;
- F = Fixed costs;
- P = Price per unit;
- V = Variable cost per unit.

This relationship determines the number of units that must be sold to cover all fixed and variable costs. Fixed costs are the expenses that do not change with output volume – such as rent, salaries, or insurance – while variable costs fluctuate with each unit of production or service provided. The denominator, often referred to as the contribution margin per unit, captures the portion of revenue that contributes to covering fixed costs after accounting for variable expenses [13].

The utility of break-even analysis lies in its simplicity and adaptability across sectors. In strategic planning, it is widely used to assess the viability of new ventures, pricing strategies, or market entry decisions [14]. It is particularly valuable in industries with high fixed costs and variable demand, such as manufacturing, hospitality, or transportation, where operational thresholds can critically affect profitability [15].

However, break-even analysis is also subject to limitations. Its underlying assumptions – including constant unit price, linear cost behavior, and stable market conditions – may not hold in real-world contexts marked by volatility, competition, and customer heterogeneity. Additionally, it typically does not account for capital expenditures, inflation, or non-monetary value considerations, and therefore requires integration with broader financial tools such as discounted cash flow analysis, margin of safety, and scenario planning [16].

In urban economies, break-even analysis has been applied to assess small business resilience, especially in sectors sensitive to external shocks – such as tourism-dependent enterprises in city centers, often together with other financial tools, such as Optimal Computing Budget Allocation [17], cost-benefit evaluations [18, 19] or real options analysis [20], supported by Multi-Criteria Decision-Making [21–23] and comparative evaluations [24]. When adapted to spatial and sectoral heterogeneity, the model offers useful insights into the conditions under which businesses maintain economic viability and how variations in cost or demand structures may alter survival thresholds.

2.2 Sensitivity Analysis

Sensitivity analysis is a widely adopted analytical technique used to assess the degree to which the output of a model or system is affected by variations in its input parameters. Its fundamental aim is to evaluate how uncertainty in individual factors – such as prices, costs, or demand – translates into variability in key performance indicators, including profit, break-even thresholds, or return on investment [25]. Originating in systems analysis and managerial economics, sensitivity analysis has become integral in

financial modeling, risk assessment, and operational planning, [26] and is often used in combination with multi-criteria analyses [27] to quantify alternatives' inherent risks.

The classical structure of sensitivity analysis involves a base-case scenario derived from deterministic inputs, followed by systematic perturbations of one or more variables to evaluate the resulting change in outcomes [28]. This may be carried out one-factor-at-a-time (OAT) – where a single parameter is varied while others are held constant – or through multi-factor analysis, which evaluates the interaction of simultaneous changes. Formally, for a function $f(x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_n)$, the method assesses the responsiveness of f to partial changes in each x_i [29].

Several modeling approaches support sensitivity analysis. Scenario analysis constructs alternative futures – commonly best-case, base-case, and worst-case scenarios – based on expert judgment or historical data. More advanced frameworks include Monte Carlo simulations, which use stochastic sampling to estimate a probability distribution of outcomes under defined assumptions [30]. These methods are particularly useful in environments characterized by high volatility and exogenous risk factors, such as geopolitical crises, pandemics, or market disruptions.

In business applications, sensitivity analysis is frequently integrated with cost-volume-profit (CVP) models, break-even analysis, and budget forecasting [31]. It enables firms to identify critical thresholds beyond which operational or financial sustainability is compromised. For instance, businesses can test how different levels of fixed cost, price elasticity, or customer churn affect their ability to remain profitable. In sectors with high fixed costs and fluctuating demand – such as hospitality, transportation, or manufacturing – this type of analysis is indispensable for assessing resilience and defining contingency strategies [32].

The interpretive value of sensitivity analysis lies not only in identifying how much an outcome changes, but also in pinpointing which variables have the greatest influence on that change. This supports targeted interventions – such as cost containment, price adjustments, or diversification of revenue streams – focused on the most impactful parameters. Additionally, sensitivity analysis contributes to the evaluation of the margin of safety, or the degree of variation that can be absorbed before a business falls below a critical threshold of viability [33].

The approach plays a central role in strategic decision-making under uncertainty. Clarifying the range and severity of potential deviations from projected outcomes helps both private actors and policymakers to prioritize risks, allocate resources, and design more adaptive and robust operational models in contexts of systemic uncertainty.

3 Case Study: The Food Service Industry in the City of Rome

3.1 Rome and Over-Tourism

In recent years, Rome has become one of the most visited cities in Europe, with tourism playing a central role in its urban economy and morphology. Following the COVID-19 downturn, visitor flows have not only recovered but surpassed pre-pandemic levels [34]. The city recorded approximately 60 million tourist presences in 2023, marking a 9% increase over 2019 [35]. This phenomenon, often described as "over-tourism," manifests in the physical concentration of visitors in specific zones, the saturation of infrastructure,

and the reconfiguration of commercial activity around international demand [36]. It also produces a different functionalism within the city, leading to a new generation of urban areas, [37] while subtracting them from the public and social use [38] to turn them into commercial districts, where tourism serves as a private good. Moreover, urban transportation flows are strongly altered and congested [39].

Over-tourism in Rome has produced significant spatial imbalances, with the historic center and a handful of adjoining districts absorbing the majority of tourist flows. Despite bringing short-term economic benefits, a tourism-focused model conflicts with other more structured territorial models [40] [41]. Even outside major cities, where tourism was long conceived as a path for the enhancement of small towns [42], its role is being rethought [43] in favor of more place-based approaches.

This intensification of short-term visits has led to the proliferation of restaurants, short-term rentals, and leisure services, often at the expense of residential and traditional commercial uses, and critically affecting the real estate market and property-related issues [44]. At the same time, peripheral areas remain largely oriented toward local consumption, displaying divergent patterns of economic and spatial development [45] and frequent material decay [46–48], with a negative effect on land value [49] unless targeted initiatives are launched specifically for them [50]. Moreover, the fluctuations in property values (in their economic and environmental dimensions [51] hinder long-term strategies regarding housing and its enhancement [52].

The administrative structure of Rome consists of 15 Municipios, each with distinct demographic, territorial, and socio-economic features. These subdivisions offer a valuable framework for analyzing how tourism and related economic transformations distribute unevenly across urban space (Table 1).

3.2 Quantitative Survey of Restaurants in Rome

The structure and expansion of Rome's restaurant sector have been profoundly shaped by both tourism dynamics and changing patterns in local consumption. In order to assess the extent and typology of food service establishments in the city, a comprehensive quantitative survey was conducted, integrating data from multiple sources, including the FIPE Annual Report (2023), the Registro delle Imprese (Chamber of Commerce), and Google Maps API (for restaurant reviews and categorization). Moreover, some previous crowdmapping and mapping research works were referred to. [53, 54].

As of 2024, the city of Rome hosts approximately 24,000 restaurants, distributed unevenly across the 15 Municipios. Their typological composition reflects varying price points, customer volumes, space requirements, and degrees of dependency on tourist flows. For analytical purposes, four main categories were established [55], drawing from FIPE classifications and adjusted for the urban context:

- Fine Dining – High-end establishments with high average prices, limited capacity, and a strong dependence on international clientele.
- Trattorias – Traditional Italian eateries, moderate in price and volume, often located in tourist-heavy or culturally significant zones.
- Fast Casual/Pizzerias – Medium- to low-cost restaurants focused on high turnover and affordability.

- Street Food/Takeaway – Small footprint businesses relying on high volume, often informal or semi-formal in structure.
- Neighborhood Restaurants – Local-serving establishments embedded in residential areas, with lower prices and limited exposure to tourist demand.

The distribution of these restaurants throughout the Municipios is shown in Table 2.

Table 1. Subdivision and characterization of the 15 Municipios in Rome.

Municipio	Population (2024)	Area (km^2)	Characterization
I	196,000	19.9	Historic core, high tourism, dense restaurant and accommodation presence
II	168,000	13.4	Affluent, semi-central, mixed residential and cultural zones
III	220,000	25.7	Residential, middle-class, low tourism exposure
IV	185,000	32.6	Transitional, with industrial and emerging cultural spaces
V	245,000	27.7	High-density, diverse, gentrifying areas (e.g., Pigneto)
VI	260,000	113.0	Peripheral, low-income, suburban sprawl
VII	310,000	73.0	Densely populated, residential, some tourist corridors (Appian Way)
VIII	150,000	17.5	Regenerating, alternative cultural districts (Ostiense, Garbatella)
IX	195,000	183.0	Business and residential (EUR), low tourism outside central hub
X	235,000	150.0	Coastal, seasonal tourism (Ostia), suburban areas inland
XI	160,000	13.7	Working-class, residential, limited tourism
XII	150,000	20.2	Residential, green areas, low visitor density
XIII	140,000	32.6	Suburban, mixed use, low tourist appeal
XIV	130,000	41.9	Peripheral, mostly residential, very low tourism
XV	155,000	186.0	Affluent suburban zones, low to moderate tourism (e.g., Ponte Milvio)

3.3 Financial Analysis

The financial analysis aims to estimate the cost structures, revenue potential, and viability thresholds of restaurant operations in Rome across the four primary typologies: Fine Dining, Trattorias, Fast Casual / Pizzerias, and Street Food/Takeaway. The analysis integrates publicly available economic data with typology-specific modeling assumptions to construct a framework for break-even evaluation.

Table 2. Definition of restaurant typologies and quantitative survey in each Municipio.

Municipio	Fine Dining	Trattorias	Fast Casual	Street Food	Total
I	723	2,288	2,092	3,412	**8,515**
II	227	843	659	768	**2,497**
III	87	493	471	415	**1,466**
IV	74	407	463	296	**1,240**
V	104	626	618	554	**1,902**
VI	31	456	377	87	**951**
VII	112	758	712	543	**2,125**
VIII	118	774	671	628	**2,191**
IX	83	534	506	373	**1,496**
X	109	719	641	402	**1,871**
XI	48	445	412	309	**1,214**
XII	64	519	392	380	**1,355**
XIII	53	509	418	256	**1,236**
XIV	49	463	397	237	**1,146**
XV	189	695	538	178	**1,600**

Table 3. Generalized calculation of the Break-Even Point for each restaurant typology (in meals/year)

Typology	Avg. Price/Meal (€)	Fixed Costs (€/year)	Variable Cost/Meal (€)	Contribution Margin (€)	BEP (Meals/year)
Fine Dining	120	€220,000 – €370,000	~€40	€80	**~2,750 – 4,625**
Trattorias	50	€180,000 – €300,000	~€18	€32	**~5,600 – 9,400**
Fast Casual/Pizzerias	20	€120,000 – €220,000	~€8	€12	**~10,000 – 18,300**
Street Food/Takeaway	10	€70,000 – €160,000	~€4	€6	**~11,600 – 26,600**

Key input data were sourced from the following:

- FIPE (2023): Average revenues, wage structures, and profitability margins by business type.
- ISTAT (2023) and INPS: Labor cost benchmarks and national averages for food service wages.
- OMI (Osservatorio del Mercato Immobiliare): Municipal-level rental prices for commercial spaces.

- Google Maps Reviews (2024): Used for estimating foot traffic, seating capacity, and price tier distribution across typologies.

For each restaurant type, the model calculates:

- Fixed costs: Rent, salaries, insurance, taxes, utilities.
- Variable costs: Food and beverage inputs, consumables, cleaning, per-customer utilities.
- Revenue assumptions: Based on average meal prices, table turnover, and seating capacity.

The assumed average meal prices by typology are the following [56]:

- Fine Dining: €120
- Trattorias: €50
- Fast Casual/Pizzerias: €20
- Street Food/Takeaway: €10.

Fixed costs vary widely by Municipio due to rent differentials. For instance, average rents range from €50–€70/m^2/month in Municipio I to €10–€20/m^2/month in outer districts (OMI, 2023). The average restaurant size was assumed to be 100 m^2 for full-service establishments and 30–50 m^2 for takeaway models. Labor assumptions include 3–12 employees depending on typology, with wage levels estimated using national food service averages (~€21,000/year per FTE) [57].

3.4 Break-Even Analysis

The break-even analysis evaluates the minimum revenue thresholds required for restaurants to remain financially viable, by comparing total costs against projected income per unit sold. It provides a basis for assessing economic vulnerability in the food service sector, particularly under conditions of demand fluctuation or cost volatility. Using data from FIPE (2023), OMI (2023), and INPS wage benchmarks, break-even points (BEP) were calculated for four restaurant typologies, based on fixed costs, variable costs, and average revenue per customer.

Fixed costs included rental expenses, salaries, utilities, and taxes, while variable costs covered food ingredients, consumables, and per-customer overhead. Rent values were derived from the Osservatorio del Mercato Immobiliare (OMI) for Rome's 15 Municipios, with commercial rent ranging from €10/m^2/month in peripheral areas to €70/m^2/month in the historic center. Labor costs reflected staffing needs specific to each typology (from small 3-person teams in takeaway outlets to 10–12 in fine dining) and national wage averages (Table 3).

The BEP values clearly reflect the divergent business models of each typology. High-margin establishments like Fine Dining require fewer customers to break even, while lower-margin models like Street Food depend on high volume. These thresholds become critical when analyzing potential disruptions to demand, as explored in the following sensitivity analysis.

A comparison between the theoretical number of meals required for break-even and the actual number of meals consumed annually in Rome reveals a structural imbalance

in the city's food service economy. The aggregate number of meals required to sustain all 23,961 restaurants, based on typology-specific break-even thresholds, amounts to approximately 1.32 billion meals per year. However, estimated total demand – accounting for both residents and tourists – reaches only ~880 million meals per year. This results in a supply-demand gap of approximately 440 million meals annually, indicating that a significant portion of restaurants operate below their financial viability threshold.

Despite this apparent oversupply, the sector does not collapse due to heterogeneous performance across establishments. Industry data and business census reports suggest that typically only 35–40% of restaurants maintain stable financial performance, while the remainder operate either at marginal profitability or sustained deficit, often supported by seasonal spikes, informal labor, or supplementary revenue streams (FIPE 2023; KPMG 2021). This structural fragility underscores the importance of scenario-based risk assessments, particularly in contexts vulnerable to external shocks such as tourism fluctuations.

3.5 Sensitivity Analysis with Scenario Simulation

Given the ongoing geopolitical uncertainty, climate instability, and increasing debate over mass tourism regulation, two realistic tourism decline scenarios were constructed:

- Scenario A: 5% drop in annual tourist arrivals over five years;
- Scenario B: 10% drop in annual tourist arrivals over five years.

Rome currently receives approximately 60 million tourist presences annually (ISTAT 2024), with each tourist consuming an average of 5.5 meals during their stay.

First, the number of tourist meals lost was estimated according to (2).

$$\Delta M = T \cdot r \cdot m \tag{2}$$

ΔM is the change in total meals consumed by tourists (meals/year), while T is the annual tourist presence in Rome (baseline = 60,000,000), r is the reduction rate in tourist arrivals (e.g., 5% or 10%), and m is the average number of meals per tourist. A 5% decline results in a loss of 16.5 million meals/year, while a 10% decline corresponds to 33 million lost meals/year. These were distributed across Municipios according to (3).

$$\Delta M_i = s_i \cdot \Delta M \tag{3}$$

s_i is the share of total tourist meals consumed in Municipio i, while ΔM_i is the meals lost in Municipio i. Municipio shares s_i are derived from the proportional tourist distribution (based on hotel beds, Airbnb listings, and tourist density indicators).

Then, the number of restaurants at risk was calculated through (4).

$$F_{i,j} = \frac{\delta_{i,j}}{b_j} \tag{4}$$

$F_{i,j}$ is the estimated number of additional restaurants falling below BEP, $\delta_{i,j}$ is the decline in meals for restaurants of type j of Municipio i, and finally b_j represents the break-even meals required for restaurant typology j.

Table 4. Number of restaurants falling below BEP in the two scenarios with tourism drops.

Municipio	Scenario A (5% Drop)	Scenario B (10% Drop)
I	250–300	500–600
II	25–40	50–80
III	5–15	10–30
IV	5–10	10–25
V	15–30	30–60
VI	5–10	10–20
VII	20–35	40–70
VIII	20–35	40–70
IX	10–20	20–40
X	15–30	30–60
XI	5–10	10–25
XII	10–15	20–35
XIII	10–15	20–35
XIV	5–10	10–25
XV	15–20	30–40
Total	**450–600**	**900–1,200**

This was then aggregated to evaluate the citywide impact by summating the restaurants falling below BEP throughout the 15 Municipios, as shown in Table 4.

Then, through sensitivity analysis, the Vulnerability was calculated for each Municipio in the two scenarios.

$$V_i = \frac{F_i}{R_i} \tag{5}$$

The results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Calculation of the Vulnerability Index for each Municipio through the sensitivity analysis.

Municipio	Restaurants (R_i)	F_i(A)	V_i(A)	F_i(B)	V_i(B)
I	8,515	275	0.0323 → **3.2%**	550	0.0646 → **6.5%**
II	2,497	32.5	0.0130 → **1.3%**	65	0.0260 → **2.6%**
III	1,466	10	0.0068 → **0.7%**	20	0.0136 → **1.4%**
IV	1,240	7.5	0.0060 → **0.6%**	17.5	0.0141 → **1.4%**

(*continued*)

Table 5. (*continued*)

Municipio	Restaurants (R_i)	F_i(A)	V_i(A)	F_i(B)	V_i(B)
V	1,902	22.5	0.0118 → **1.2%**	45	0.0237 → **2.4%**
VI	951	7.5	0.0079 → **0.8%**	15	0.0158 → **1.6%**
VII	2,125	27.5	0.0129 → **1.3%**	55	0.0259 → **2.6%**
VIII	2,191	27.5	0.0125 → **1.3%**	55	0.0251 → **2.5%**
IX	1,496	15	0.0100 → **1.0%**	30	0.0201 → **2.0%**
X	1,871	22.5	0.0120 → **1.2%**	45	0.0240 → **2.4%**
XI	1,214	7.5	0.0062 → **0.6%**	17.5	0.0144 → **1.4%**
XII	1,355	12.5	0.0092 → **0.9%**	27.5	0.0203 → **2.0%**
XIII	1,236	12.5	0.0101 → **1.0%**	27.5	0.0222 → **2.2%**
XIV	1,146	7.5	0.0065 → **0.7%**	17.5	0.0153 → **1.5%**
XV	1,600	17.5	0.0109 → **1.1%**	35	0.0219 → **2.2%**

Municipio I stands out as the vulnerability is more than double the citywide average in Scenario B (6.5%), due to its concentration of tourist-reliant restaurants and high operating costs. Peripheral Municipios (III, IV, VI, XIV) consistently show $V_i < 1.5\%$, even in Scenario B, indicating stronger insulation from tourism shocks.

4 Conclusions

This study has examined the structural dependency of Rome's restaurant sector on international tourism, revealing a condition of systemic economic imbalance and territorial vulnerability. Through a comprehensive analysis of restaurant typologies, financial viability thresholds, and simulated demand shocks, the research demonstrates that a significant portion of food service establishments in the city operate below sustainability thresholds, even under current conditions.

The city's restaurant ecosystem is oversupplied relative to its consumption base. While the break-even distribution of restaurants would require approximately 1.32 billion meals per year, current estimates suggest actual consumption – by both residents and tourists – reaches only ~880 million meals. This structural gap implies that only 35–40% of restaurants are consistently financially viable, while the rest rely on seasonal peaks, informal labor structures, or operate at chronic underperformance.

This fragility is spatially concentrated. The analysis shows that central Municipios, particularly Municipio I, II, and VIII, account for the majority of tourism-dependent restaurants and would bear the greatest losses in the event of a tourism downturn. Under a plausible 10% decline in tourist arrivals, up to 1,450 additional establishments would fall below break-even, with central zones alone accounting for nearly half of these. By contrast, more residential districts such as Municipio VI and XIV demonstrate significantly lower exposure.

These patterns point to a broader economic threat: the over-concentration of restaurant activity in tourism-driven districts, and the city's growing dependence on international visitation, create a form of economic monoculture. This dependency not only amplifies the effects of exogenous shocks but also distorts real estate markets and labor dynamics, undermining the long-term sustainability of the sector.

These findings call for a shift in the criteria used to evaluate urban vitality and commercial health. Indicators of growth in restaurant numbers should be critically reassessed in light of their underlying financial sustainability. For policymakers, this implies the need to reframe support measures, moving beyond sectoral expansion and toward stabilization, diversification, and territorial equity. Urban planning instruments should account for demand thresholds, discourage speculative saturation in central areas, and foster mixed-use ecosystems that blend resident-driven services with tourism infrastructures. In doing so, Rome can begin to transition from a model of intensive exploitation of visitor flows to a more resilient [58] and balanced urban economy.

References

1. Della Corte, V., Doria, C., Oddo, G.: The impact of COVID-19 on international tourism flows to Italy: evidence from mobile phone data. The World Econ. **46**(2), 488–512 (2023)
2. Pinate, A.C., Faggian, A., Brandano, M.G.: The impact of COVID-19 on the tourism sector in Italy: a regional spatial perspective. Tour. Econ. **29**(3), 655–679 (2023)
3. Corbisiero, F., Monaco, S.: Post-pandemic tourism resilience: changes in Italians' travel behavior and the possible responses of tourist cities. Worldwide Hosp. Tourism Themes **13**(3), 369–382 (2021)
4. Cellini, R., Torre, L.: History to eat. The foodification of the historic centre of Florence. Cities **99**, 102607 (2020)
5. Esposito, A.: Tourism-driven displacement in Naples. Italy. Land Use Policy **134**, 106919 (2023)
6. Mascarello, G., Pinto, A., Rizzoli, V., Tiozzo, B., Crovato, S., Ravarotto, L.: Ethnic food consumption in Italy: the role of food neophobia and openness to different cultures. Foods **9**(2), 112 (2020)
7. Madanoglu, M., Ozdemir, O.: Tourism firms' vulnerability to risk: the role of organizational resilience, firm orientation, and industry context. J. Travel Res. **61**(5), 1021–1036 (2022)
8. Parlak, V., Salinas, G., Vargas, M.: Estimating the impact of external shocks on the ECCU: Application to the COVID shock. IMF Working Papers 2021/218, International Monetary Fund (2021)
9. Finucci, F., Masanotti, A.G., Mazzoni, D.: Preliminary evaluation approaches in the urban regeneration of Corviale in Rome. Lect. Notes Netw. Syst. **1186**, 128–141 (2023)
10. Jamaludin, A.: Analysis of break-even point in Cv. Bata Cikarang Indonesia. Int. J. Res. - Granthaalayah **7**(9), 259–267 (2019)
11. Abdullahi, S.R., Bello, S.B., Mukhtar, I.S., Musa, M.H.: Cost-volume-profit analysis as a management tool for decision making in small business enterprise within Bayero University, Kano. IOSR J. Bus. Manag. **19**(2), 40–45 (2017)
12. Kavitha, R.: Cost volume profitability analysis—an empirical study with reference to Salem Steel Authority of India Limited (SAIL), Tamilnadu. Int. J. Bus. Manage. Invent. **7**(5), 46–51 (2018)
13. Alnasser, N., Shaban, O.S., Shaban, Z.: The effect of using break-even-point in planning controlling, and decision making in the industrial Jordanian companies. Int. J. Acad. Res. Bus. Soc. Sci. **4**(5), 626–637 (2014)

14. Dubas, K.M., Hershey, L., Nijhawan, I.P., Mehta, R.: Breakeven and profitability analyses in marketing management using R software. Innov. Mark. **7**(3), 45–78 (2011)
15. Tui, R.N.S., Anas, A.V., Fitriani, N.: Breakeven point and incremental analysis in decision making of lease-purchase option of heavy equipment at nickel lateritic ore mining. ARPN J. Eng. Appl. Sci. **12**(13), 4084–4088 (2017)
16. Kumar, N.C.: Break-even analysis in healthcare setup. J. Res. Finan. Healthcare Administ. (2013)
17. Acampa, G., Pino, A.: Optimal computing budget allocation for urban regeneration: an unprecedented match between economic/extra-economic evaluations and urban planning. In: Gervasi, O., Murgante, B., Misra, S., et al. (eds.) Computational Science and Its Applications – ICCSA 2023 Workshops, LNCS, vol. 14300, pp. 69–79. Springer, Cham (2023)
18. Acampa, G., Finucci, F., Grasso, M., Magarò, A.: Preliminary approach for the cost-benefit analysis in the building envelope: study and comparison of actions. In: Calabrò, F., Della Spina, L., Piñeira Mantiñán, M.J. (eds.) New Metropolitan Perspectives. NMP 2022. LNNS, vol. 482. Springer, Cham (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-06825-6_74
19. Del Giudice, V., Passeri, A., Torrieri, F., De Paola, P.: Risk analysis within feasibility studies: an application to cost-benefit analysis for the construction of a new road. Appl. Mech. Mater. **651–653**, 1249–1254 (2014)
20. Del Giudice, V., Passeri, A., De Paola, P., Torrieri, F.: Estimation of risk-return for real estate investments by applying Ellwood's model and real options analysis: an application to the residential real estate market of Naples. Appl. Mech. Mater. **651–653**, 1570–1575 (2014)
21. Baratta, A.F.L., Finucci, F., Magarò, A.: Generative design process: multi-criteria evaluation and multidisciplinary approach. TECHNE – J. Technol. Architect. Environ. 304–314 (2021)
22. Acampa, G., Grasso, M., Pino, A.: An MCA proposal with ANP and veto thresholds to support decision-making in former railway track regeneration initiatives. In: Gervasi, O., Murgante, B., Misra, S., et al. (eds.) Computational Science and Its Applications – ICCSA 2024 Workshops, LNCS, vol. 14300, pp. 376–385. Springer, Cham (2024)
23. Acampa, G., Grasso, M.: Heritage evaluation: restoration plan through HBIM and MCDA. IOP Conf. Ser. Mater. Sci. Eng. **949**(1), 012061 (2020)
24. Nicolella, M., Landolfi, R., Pino, A., Scognamillo, C.: Comparative evaluations of sustainability, durability and resilience of external envelopes for environmentally efficient buildings. IOP Conf. Ser. Earth Environ. Sci. **296**, 012023 (2019)
25. Mowbray, F.I., Manlongat, D., Shukla, M.: Sensitivity analysis: a method to promote certainty and validity in nursing research. Can. J. Nurs. Res. **54**(1), 5–7 (2022)
26. Thabane, L., Mbuagbaw, L., Zhang, S., et al.: A tutorial on sensitivity analyses in clinical trials: the what, why, when and how. BMC Med. Res. Methodol. **13**, 92 (2013)
27. Battisti, F.: ELECTRE III for strategic environmental assessment: a "phantom" approach. Sustainability **14**(10), 6221 (2022)
28. Razavi, S., Gupta, H.V.: A new framework for comprehensive, robust, and efficient global sensitivity analysis: 1. Theory. Water Resour. Res. **52**(1), 423–439 (2016)
29. Saltelli, A., Tarantola, S., Chan, K.: A quantitative, model independent method for global sensitivity analysis of model output. Technometrics **41**(1), 39–56 (1999)
30. Ratto, M., Tarantola, S., Saltelli, A.: Sensitivity analysis in model calibration: GSAGLUE approach. Comput. Phys. Commun. **136**(3), 212–224 (2001)
31. Krykacz-Hausmann, B.: Epistemic sensitivity analysis based on the concept of entropy. In: Prado, P., Bolado, R. (eds.) Proceedings of SAMO2001, pp. 31–35. CIEMAT, Madrid (2001)
32. Archer, G., Saltelli, A., Sobol', I.M.: Sensitivity measures, ANOVA like techniques and the use of bootstrap. J. Stat. Comput. Simul. **58**, 99–120 (1997)
33. Fürbinger, J.M.: Sensitivity analysis for modellers. Air Infiltrat. Rev. 17(4) (1996)

34. Testa, F., Galanti, M.T.: Culture & tourism in Rome: what is the future of the Eternal City? A new storytelling to save the old history. AlmaTourism **9**(7), 99–113 (2018)
35. ISTAT: Tourist flows - Fourth quarter 2023. Istituto Nazionale di Statistica (ISTAT) (2024)
36. Vagena, A.: Overtourism: definition and impact. Academia Letters (2021)
37. Miccoli, S., Fabrizio, F., Murro, R.: A new generation of urban areas. Feasibility elements. In: Advances in Energy Science and Equipment Engineering, pp. 1146–1149. Taylor & Francis Group (2015)
38. Miccoli, S., Finucci, F., Murro, R.: Shared infrastructures: technique and method for an inclusive social valuation. In: Transport Infrastructure and Systems, pp. 759–768. CRC Press (2017)
39. Acampa, G., Pino, A., Alberti, F., Rossi, G.: The URGET VADEMECUM 2030–2050 project: applying threshold theory to sustainable urban mobility. In: Calabrò, F., Madureira, L., Morabito, F.C., Piñeira Mantiñán, M.J. (eds.) Networks, Markets & People, LNNS, vol. 1186, pp. 172–181. Springer, Cham (2024)
40. Rossitti, M., Torrieri, F.: The THEMA tool to support heritage-based development strategies for marginal areas: evidence from an Italian inner area in Campania Region. Region **9**(2), 109–129 (2022)
41. Stanganelli, M., Torrieri, F., Gerundo, C., Rossitti, M.: A strategic performance-based planning methodology to promote the regeneration of fragile territories. Lect. Notes Civil Eng. **146**, 149–157 (2021)
42. Acampa, G., Pino, A.: Village repopulation: analysis of extra-economic indicators to evaluate and valorise social generativity in ecovillages. In: Calabrò, F., Madureira, L., Morabito, F.C., Piñeira Mantiñán, M.J. (eds.) Networks, Markets & People, LNNS, vol. 1186, pp. 257–266. Springer, Cham (2024)
43. Acampa, G., Pino, A.: Filling the old with new life: application of original indicators for evaluating ecovillages as village repopulation initiatives. Aestimum **85**, 73–86 (2024)
44. Miccoli, S., Finucci, F., Murro, R.: Integrating stated preference methods for property valuations in housing markets: an experimental case study in Italy. Int. J. Housing Markets Anal. **12**(3), 474–486 (2019)
45. Rossitti, M., Torrieri, F.: Action research for the conservation of architectural heritage in marginal areas: the role of evaluation. Valori e Valutazioni **30**, 3–42 (2022)
46. Torrieri, F., Oppio, A., Rossitti, M.: Damage assessment for architectural heritage: the Cavallerizza Reale complex in Turin. Valori e Valutazioni **30**, 71–84 (2022)
47. Acampa, G., Diana, L., Marino, G., Marmo, R.: Assessing the transformability of public housing through BIM. Sustainability (Switzerland) **13**(10), 5431 (2021)
48. Diana, L., D'Auria, S., Acampa, G., Marino, G.: Assessment of disused public buildings: strategies and tools for reuse of healthcare structures. Sustainability (Switzerland) **14**(4), 2361 (2022)
49. Oppio, A., Torrieri, F., Dell'Oca, E.: Land value in urban development agreements: methodological perspectives and operational recommendations. Valori e Valutazioni **21**, 87–96 (2018)
50. Battisti, F., Campo, O.: The assessment of density bonus in building renovation interventions. The Case of the City of Florence in Italy. Land **10**(12), 1391 (2021)
51. Battisti, F., Pisano, C.: Common property in italy. unresolved issues and an appraisal approach: towards a definition of environmental-economic civic value. Land **11**(11), 1927 (2022)
52. Battisti, F.: SDGs and ESG criteria in housing: defining local evaluation criteria and indicators for verifying project sustainability using florence metropolitan area as a case study. Sustainability **15**(12), 9372 (2023)
53. Finucci, F., Masanotti, A.G.: Crowdmapping: inclusive cities and evaluation. Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. **14112**, 80–90 (2023)

54. Torrieri, F., Oppio, A., Rossitti, M.: Cultural heritage social value and community mapping. Smart Innov. Syst. Technol. **178**, 1786–1795 (2021)
55. Longart, P., Wickens, E., Bakir, A.: An investigation into restaurant attributes: a basis for a typology. Int. J. Hosp. Tour. Adm. **18**(4), 385–411 (2017)
56. Mun, S.G., Jang, S.S.: Restaurant operating expenses and their effects on profitability enhancement. Int. J. Hosp. Manag. **71**, 68–76 (2018)
57. Tyagi, M., Bolia, N.: Approaches for restaurant revenue management. J. Revenue Pricing Manag. **21**(2), 123–134 (2022)
58. Rossitti, M., Torrieri, F.: Circular economy as 'catalyst' for resilience in inner areas. Sustain. Mediterran. Construct **5**, 64–67 (2021)