



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_29292
Title of the Manuscript:	Foreign Migration of Brands discussed under the light of Intersubjectivity Perspective: Illustration with a Case of Food Products
Type of the Article	Professional paper

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	At the beginning of introduction “4P” and “6C” concepts are pointed out as two main steps in evolution of marketing theory connected with communication –on what arguments is this statement based? I would suggest to reformulate this statement. Paragraph that starts with sentence “During the past decades, communication ...” (line 28 – 34) contains few statements that needs to be backed up with references to previous researches. Research question is explained with mentioning the concept of brand trust. The connection is latter more emphasized in the chapter 4.3. I would suggest to give little more attention to the brand trust concept and the previous researches to this topic, which are very extensive (eg. A. Chaudhuri, M. B. Holbrook, E. Delgado-Ballester, Erdem and Swait, J. S. Hess, etc.)	This was reformulated. References were added. Comments and references were added in agreement with this very useful suggestion.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In the paragraph on pg. 3, after fig. 1 authors uses “we” in the sentence referring to themselves – sentence should be to passive form “research was formed to aim at further...” At Table 1 it is used term “Anglo-Saxon subjects” even though it was earlier explained that through the text this term will be represented as “English subjects” – it is necessary to correct to keep the consistency. Proofreading necessary.	This has been done and corrected in this paragraph and also in all the paper when appropriate. Corrected. Done.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is Professional paper, Original Research Article because contribution of the paper is focused solely to help producer not to make mistakes in their professional decisions in applicative food brand management; no scientific contribution is mentioned. Also there is some doubts about subjects chosen to the sample – this is obvious convenience sample (vs representative sample). Econometrics are also done on the basis of too small sample for quantitative study. This is quantitative study although it is combined with qualitative method of observation before conducting the survey. Otherwise the paper is well written, logically structured and represented.	Comments regarding the scientific contribution were added in abstract and in section “Conclusions”. Comments were added to justify this choice in section “Method” and discussion was added in section 4.4 “Limits”. Comments were added to warn the readers about this point; however, we did not intend to provide a representative survey of a given population: this was added in comments too.
---	--	--