



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_22005
Title of the Manuscript:	Are Mom-and-Pop Stores in Decline? A Perspective of Service Outputs on Self-Employed Retailers in Taiwan
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	The title of the paper does not match with the contents. A revised title which emphasizes the survival of mom & pop stores in spite of growing number of convenience stores and hyper markets is to be considered.	Thank you for this comment. I have revised the title as your suggestion as follows: How Mom-and-Pop Stores Compete with Grocery Chains? A Perspective of Service Outputs on Self-Employed Retailers in Taiwan
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Explanation related to waiting and delivery time does not seem apt. It is not clear. More clarity needed related to this point. (Line number 202 to 213).	Thank you for drawing my attention to this. I agree that this paragraph is unclear. I have revised in the text that can be found on page 6, line 205-207. The interviewees reflected that it was indeed more convenient to place an order through their stores rather than to order directly from the manufacturers, especially for those who were required orders with large quantity and consumption in advance.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Except for the above changes, the paper is a good attempt.	Thanks for your encouragement!