

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_125508
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of Digital Transformation on Service Models and Employee Skill Requirements in Taiwan's Real Estate Brokerage Industry
Type of the Article	Research paper

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<div>1. This research works is relevant to the scientific community for several reasons, especially within the fields of business, real estate, human resource management, and digital innovation.</div> <div>2. It contributes new paradigm towards digital transformation and bridges the gaps in real estate sector which lags behind the new norms,</div> <div>3. One of the innovative perspectives of the paper is the overview of "internal case circulation" as a key factor in real estate brokerage operations.</div> <div>4. This methodological framework of SEM and HLL analysis is valuable for scholars interested in understanding the complex interplay of technology organizational change, and human resource development.</div> <div>5. I particularly appreciate the paper's comprehensive analysis of employee and organizational factors, integrating both qualitative and quantitative methods to deliver robust findings. This approach deepens our understanding of how compensation systems and employee performance impact corporate competitiveness, making it a highly valuable resource for academics and practitioners alike.</div>	Thank you again for the thoughtful and encouraging feedback.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the article title is Good to go.	Thank you for your thoughtful and constructive comments.
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract has the idea of the topic, research methods, finds and utility to economy. One line about the variables can make the abstract more impactful.	Thank you for your constructive feedback regarding the abstract. i have revised the abstract following your suggestion to revise the impact by including specific variables while maintaining clarity on the topic, research methods, findings, and economic utility.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The Data collection Technique details can be made more specific and research methods can be explained more concisely.	<div>Thank you for your valuable feedback regarding the Data Collection Techniques section. We have addressed your comments by making the following specific revisions in the manuscript:</div> <div><div>1. Enhanced Quantitative Data Collection Details:</div><div><div>Added precise survey statistics (response rate: 78%, 200 out of 256 distributed)</div><div>Specified the digital platform used (Qualtrics)</div><div>Included exact timeframes (January-March 2024)</div><div>Added average completion time (25 minutes)</div><div>Detailed the reminder protocol (three follow-ups at 2-week intervals)</div></div><div>2. Strengthened Qualitative Methods:</div><div><div>Specified the exact composition of expert panels (5 senior executives, 4 digital specialists, 3 academic experts, 3 HR professionals)</div><div>Added detailed coding process with reliability metrics (Cohen's κ values of 0.78, 0.85, and 0.91)</div><div>Included specific sample sizes and saturation points (178 interviews for saturation, 200 total)</div></div></div>

Review Form 3

		<p>3. Made Research Methods More Concise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reorganized the methodology section with clear subheadings• Added structured bullet points for better readability• Removed redundant explanations• Focused on key methodological components <p>These revisions can be found in Section 4.3 of the manuscript, highlighted by text-revised tracking. The enhanced structure provides a more precise and systematic presentation of our research methodology while maintaining clarity and conciseness.</p>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The qualitative data analysis could be made better by providing more detail on how the thematic coding was conducted (e.g., coding structure, number of coders, intercoder reliability). This would enhance the transparency and replicability of the analysis.2. The paper could benefit from increasing the number of interviews or including a more diverse sample, such as employees from different regions or companies of varying sizes because sample size of 100 is less as the industry is big enough.3. The integration of SEM, HLL and Qualitative data is a good work but it could go further in explaining how qualitative themes influenced the refinement of the quantitative models or vice versa. A clearer discussion of how the two methodologies complement each other would strengthen the study's conclusions.4. The good part of the paper is that the results reveal that compensation satisfaction has the strongest effect on employee performance (coefficient = 0.45, $p < 0.001$), and this finding aligns with the qualitative insights from employee interviews, further validating the results.	<p>Thank you for your thoughtful and constructive comments. We have addressed each point as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Regarding the qualitative data analysis transparency: We have significantly enhanced the description of our thematic coding process in Section 4.2, adding:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Detailed coding team composition (3 trained coders with expertise in real estate and organizational research)• Comprehensive coding structure (initial 45 codes refined to 25 primary codes)• Explicit intercoder reliability metrics at three stages (Cohen's $\kappa = 0.78, 0.85, \text{ and } 0.91$)• 40-hour training period and weekly calibration meetings These additions are highlighted text-revised tracking in the manuscript.2. Concerning sample size and diversity: We have expanded our sample significantly:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increased from 100 to 200 total interviews• Enhanced regional representation (Northern Taiwan: 40%, Central: 30%, Southern: 25%, Eastern: 5%)• Broadened organizational diversity:<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦ Large corporations (>500 employees): 35%◦ Medium-sized firms (100-500 employees): 40%◦ Small firms (<100 employees): 25% These changes are reflected in Section 4.2.3. Regarding methodology integration: We have strengthened the integration section (4.3) by:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Adding explicit integration points showing how qualitative findings informed SEM specification• Including examples of how quantitative results guided additional qualitative inquiry• Demonstrating how unexpected statistical findings were explored through follow-up interviews• Providing specific examples of cross-validation between methods These revisions are highlighted in Section 4.3.4. On compensation satisfaction findings: We appreciate your positive feedback on our compensation satisfaction analysis. We have further

Review Form 3

		<p>strengthened this finding by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Adding more qualitative evidence (85% of interviews emphasized importance)• Including detailed pathway analysis in the SEM results• Providing specific examples from interviews that support the quantitative findings These additions can be found in Section 5.1. <p>These revisions have significantly enhanced the methodological rigor and transparency of our study while maintaining its core strengths in revealing the relationship between compensation satisfaction and employee performance. The integrated analysis now provides a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the phenomena under study.</p>
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>As the references include latest years (2023, 2024) I find it apt and enough.</p>	<p>Thank you for your thoughtful and constructive comments.</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		<p>Thank you for your thoughtful and constructive comments.</p>
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes the language is fine</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>None</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	