



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_32648
Title of the Manuscript:	Customers and Employees Assessment of Corporate Branding Benefits
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	1- The study is done for only one company (blind) at a certain year, this entails the lack of: • Internal validity: no statistics for any internal validity or goodness of measure. It can be improved either by constructing a time series for the same company or goodness statistics for questionnaire type method (cronbach alpha ...). • External validity: no comparison with other rivals in the same industry. It can be improved by cross-sectional study for the relationship between customer brand perception and turn over. 2- Emotion of customers is a latent or operational variable that is not quantitative in nature and it can measured using other elements (other quantitative proxies for emotions). 3- Nothing is mentioned about firm performance (turn over) and there is no link how these brand attributes contribute to a better turn over. 4- The paper concludes that "branding in the pham. Industry....companies turn over": first there is no indication of the relationship between branding and turn over in this paper. Second, results can't be generalized saying "pharm. Industry" given that the study is directed to only one	Thank you very much for the suggestions. While we agree that they are very important and would enhance the quality of the manuscript, they require that the study should be re-conducted. We are sorry that this was not feasible because we currently have no logistics and budget for that. We also think the current paper, which was a case study, still provides useful information on how customers and employees of the company held different perspectives. Same response as previous Yes, that was our greatest nightmare during the study. We used the Integrated Model of Branding Effectiveness Assessment, which includes a financial metrics. However, the company was unwilling to disclose that to us. We have provided the limitation in the manuscript. Agreed, the conclusion was revised accordingly. The only related question on that



SDI Review Form 1.6

	company that we don't know anything about (minimum financial data is not mentioned at all, is it quoted or not?...), to improve this point you can refer to points 1 and 2.	was asking the employees whether there was a relation between the company's level of corporate branding and sales turn over. This was subjective and may not necessarily correlate with the company's actual turn over.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1- Better to separate introduction from literature review. 2- More details are needed regarding the questions and questionnaire and the time span of the study. 3- More descriptive stats are needed about the pharm. Industry (size, rivals, ...), employment and share of GDP. 4- What is the total number of the sample and what is the despondence rate.	For a research journal article, we think having literature review incorporated in the introduction section was appropriate. It is the standard practise. Suggestions incorporated, but detailed information on the company was not disclosed to us. 300 hundred respondents (50 employees and 250 customers). They were provided in the manuscript. We had full respondent rates, with the exception of about 60% employee respondents not disclosing their age.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1- Why to restrict the study to only one "blind" company, would be better to direct the questionnaire to many people as you can, then take the despondence rate, analyse respondents, then more generalizable results could be drawn. 2- The whole study can be improved by enriching it using econometric analysis in addition to the descriptive analysis.	Yes, we agree, but are currently constrained by logistics and budgets to go that direction. Also, we lacked financial information of the company.