

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the article title is Good to go.	
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.	
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.	
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.	<div>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.</div> <div>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.</div> <div>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.</div> <div>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.</div>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	As the references include latest years (2023, 2024) I find it apt and enough.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes the language is fine	
Optional/General comments	None	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Manisha Raj
Department, University & Country	Symbiosis International Deemed University, India