



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_13793
Title of the Manuscript:	The Feasibility of Technology-based Business Model for SMEs in Taiwan Travel Market
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. There is no research design section in this manuscript. 2. Although the "feasibility" is the core concept of this paper, this study has not talked about what factors make the HiNet Travel service feasible. 3. If the study design is a case design, the author should add a section to describe why the case was selected to address the research topic. Case design is kind of a backward design, in other words, we should choose a successful case to explore what factors are important to feasibility. On a basis of case design concept and the research topic this study entailed, that the case has been feasible for the research topic is needed to be showed in case description section. In other words, the performance of HiNet Travel service should be described in this article. 4. That the author would like to combine the business model design (strategic issue) and operational perspective to analyse the issue of feasibility is so interesting, however, the author didn't address this part deeply. 5. I suggested the author reorganizes the structure of this paper as (1)introduction, (2)literature review, (3)research design, (4)case description, (5)finding(including business model design and operational perspective), (6)conclusions.	1. This article has added a section of research design from line 260 to 286. 2. This article has added 9 factors that make this service feasible (from line 395 to line 400). 3. This article has added other sections for research design and case description from line 260 to 306. 4. This article has described and discussed the feasibility of business model for case company from line 352 to line 359 and from line 394 to line 443. 5. This paper has reorganized the article structure as reviewer's suggestion.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Referring to the innovation literature was suggested to direct the paper to explore some factors that make the Technology-based business model feasible.	This article has added literature describing the Technology-based business model feasible by line 208-234.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. The purpose of research is building a general theory, so the generalization is always a critical issue the author should notice.	Thanks for the suggestion.