



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
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 Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Modifications do not explain the contribution of the intersubjectivity dynamic theory in the analysis of the different reactions of consumers to the type of writing. Further weaknesses that need to be improved are: 1. the sample size is very limited and different in nationality; 2. the products are different; 3. the sample of consumers "adults" is not qualified (by age, profession, etc.). 4. Moreover, the second condition is only tested for the French and then by allowing a comparison.	Section 4.2 explains that only the direct perspective level of intersubjectivity structure is significantly affected in this case. Anyway, Intersubjectivity dynamic theory is not used to explain this difference, it is used here to analyze and understand an overall attitude with this case within the set of all cases. 1-The paper does not aim to provide an intercultural analysis; limits are discussed in §4.4. The difference of sample size is not a problem: statistical tests are available to analyze such cases. 2-Products are different but both presented to both samples. Anyway, this is a relevant remark which is already discussed in section "Limits". 3-Section 2.3 gives average age and gender. Additional details were added for social class. However, the main point for the selection of the subjects is their state of mind as argued in this section. 4-Comparison between nationalities was not sought in this case. As transforming the French product in a relevant manner was not possible, the relative comparison for just one nationality was estimated sufficient: additional comments has been provided and argued in section 2.1.