Review of: "Startup Project Development: Travel Schedule Management App "Triplanner""

Dimitrios Nalmpantis[1]

1 Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is a well-written manuscript regarding the development of the "Triplanner" travel schedule management app. The work is part of the Work Package 2.2 of the Erasmus+ CBHE Growing Indonesia: Triangular Approach (GITA) project.

I enjoyed reading the manuscript as it is a comprehensive review of all the required steps to develop a mobile app and its respective startup. The market and the gap are analyzed, and the same goes for the features of the product (app) with the stages of its development. There is a strategic analysis with mockup screens, including the results of a questionnaire survey, a think-aloud method, user testing, and performance measurement. Moreover, the implementation plan is presented in which various subcategories of implementation are presented such as marketing strategy, project development plan, financial plan, human resources plan, risk management plan, and future trends.

My main concern regarding the manuscript is that it provides a brief review of almost everything needed to develop an app and the respective startup to disseminate and exploit it. Despite the fact that this is what I enjoyed in the manuscript, and I think this is very useful for new entrepreneurs, I am not sure how interesting such a manuscript would be for editors who focus on scientific research. Perhaps there could be separate papers analyzing each method followed with the typical IMRaD contents' approach that would provide much more information on how the readers could apply each method according to their needs, as the information provided in this manuscript for each method is too brief. On the other hand, perhaps there are journals that are interested in such comprehensive papers that I am not aware of as a transportation engineer (probably there could be such journals in the field of marketing and patenting).

Apart from this my main concern, I have also some minor comments:

1. All the acronyms should be defined before used, e.g., ROI -> Return of Investment (ROI).
2. It is not a good idea to use abbreviations in official written language, e.g., they 've been -> they have been, don't know –> do not know, they're -> they are, etc.
3. In some parts, the English are not so clear, e.g., "which this method will be provided by the Triplanner application to promoting Indonesia tourism". I would suggest the authors use shorter sentences.
4. "we will define the obstacle" before a reference makes it difficult for the reader to understand if the author of the paper or the reference defined the obstacle.
5. "It can be a platform to discuss for them to plan a better trip for next." This is not very clear. Please rephrase.
6. 9 elements -> nine (9) elements.

7. "The results of the top locations in advertisements can be seen above and" it is not very clear what "above" refers to here.

8. 65,7% -> 65.7%

9. "Jakob Nielsen's heuristic" please provide a reference.

10. "Sauro System Usability Scale Score (2018)" is not a valid reference and it is missing from the reference list.

11. "We make it easier for users to contact us, the team has distributed contacts who can be reached via email addresses and WhatsApp numbers." I would use a semi-colon instead of a comma.

12. Much more references should be included in the manuscript and in the reference list. Whatever is referenced in the manuscript should be also included in the reference list and the other way round.

Well these are my comments more or less, I hope I provided some useful information and I hope the authors will find a journal that accepts such kind of marketing methodology review papers.