



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_3098
Title of the Manuscript:	<i>Does Sales Promotion Influence Buying Behaviour of Students? A Study of PZ Cussons Limited in Ho Municipality, Ghana</i>

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	The literature review needs to be updated. The literature used, while appropriate, is old.	Comment accepted and some literature have been updated e.g. Kotler, P. Marketing management. 11th ed. London: Pearson International; 2002. Perreault W, McCarthy J. <i>Essential of marketing: A global managerial approach</i>. 10th ed. Boston: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.;2006. Perreult W, McCarthy J. Basic marketing: A global managerial approach. 15th ed. Boston: McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.; 2005. Pickton D, Broderick A. Integrate marketing communications. 2nd ed. Harlow: Prentice Hall;2005. Schneider LG, Currim IS. Consumer purchase behaviors associated with active and passive deal-proneness. <i>International Journal of Research in Marketing</i>.1991; 8(3): 205-222



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The conclusion needs a little more discussion and explanation of the importance of the research There is room for more discussion and explanation in the results section of the paper. This was superficially done.	The comment is accepted and correction had been done under Section 3.4 of the article on pp 14 &15.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This cannot be revised, as the study has already been done. However, the sampling method of putting paper in a jug and shaking it 'vigorously' is far from scientific and leads to potential biasness issues. This should have been done in a computer program	Comment accepted and noted for future consideration please.