Response to the Editor and Reviewer #2's Comments

Firstly, we'd like to express our heartfelt thanks to the editor and all reviewers for their constructive and insightful comments.

During the past several days, we have carefully modified our manuscript several times according to the editor's and two reviewers' valuable comments. What follows are our detailed responses and revisions to the reviewers' comments. To distinguish, we put each original comment in *italic* and our responses in **blue font** in the following.

Reviewer #2's Comments:

(1) The only thing is to better include references into text and section references needs strong support. The list of references is not well presented. MPDI use own citation style with abbreviated journal names. There are some missing details, like e.g. lack of DOI numbers and lack of page numbers. MPDI has own citation style, you should use it. The same applies to in-text citations. Citing several papers in document needs to use dash character or comma. .

Response and revision: Thanks for your constructive and insightful comments. We searched and downloaded all the articles in the latest issues from Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research, and checked and revised the layout and format of citations and references one by one according to the modification suggestions and the format of *MPDI* in the published articles.

In addition to the above modifications, we also modified our manuscript several times to correct all the grammar errors and to improve its English writing. We do hope that our thorough modifications and the above-detailed illustrations are good enough to satisfy the editor's and two reviewer's requirements fully. Thank you!

We are looking forward to your positive response!