



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_10836
Title of the Manuscript:	Segmentation of Airline Market in the GCC Region: Profiling Business Customers Using Low Cost and Full Service Carriers
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Using mean and percentages alone as choice analytical tools limits the applicability of the result of this work. More enhanced analytical tools could be employed to better position the work for adoption by both private and public organisations in the airline industry. In this era of rapid change and dynamic work environments, decision makers and policy advisers of corporate organizations may require stronger analysis of derived data with a higher level of reliability on which they can comfortably base their decisions. This work is limited by that quality of high reliability because of the choice of analytical tool.	Thank you for your very insightful and encouraging comments. We agree with all of your comments on our use of percentages and means. Since a large part of our data is categorical, it is not appropriate to use certain sophisticated statistical techniques such as Multiple Regression or Structural Equation Models (SEQ). However, we have re-analysed the entire data set using Chi Square, ANOVA, ETA, and Two samples Means Test. While these statistical tools add a bit more credibility to our findings, they do not change the results reported in paper that you have reviewed. All survey questions had pretty good face validity; were easy to understand, and thus generated fairly reliable findings.
Minor REVISION comments	➤ Consider separating the implications of the work and the conclusion. Check for typographical errors. Grammatical construction and correctness must be duly	We have revised the entire paper and have made the suggested changes. Section 7 is now entitled "Conclusions and Implications". Section 6 "Findings in Review" is a discussion section and sets the



SDI Review Form 1.6

	observed since a wrong phrase or sentence may change or completely alter the flow of thought of the author. This may lead to a conclusion in the mind of the reader which is different from what the author originally intended.	platform for “Conclusions and Implication” section. The authors have extensively published in well-known international management journals and possess fairly good writing skills. However, we have re-checked the clarity of our presentation and grammar, etc. and the revised version seems to meet the standards of good English.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author may further furnish this work by analysing the data using other statistical tools to establish stronger relationship links between the tested variables i.e. the characteristics of business travellers in LCC’s and FSC’s.	As indicated above (Compulsory Revision Comments), we have thoroughly revised the data analysis and have used a combination of both parametric and non-parametric statistical tools. Most measures are based on single items, which were considered reliable and valid based on our review of the relevant literature. If we had multi-item scales, we would have certainly used Alpha reliability coefficient or other applicable methods. One of the authors has a fairly strong background in research methodology and statistics and we are quite confident that statistical tools used in the paper are appropriate.