



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_3751
Title of the Manuscript:	Purifying a Television Viewing Measure for Use in Consumer Socialization Research: An Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis Approach

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 7 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The authors claim that their article is in support of Levine et al. (2006). I think they should clearly emphasize in the introduction how they complement it, what they add, which of their limitations they overcome, etc. It seems weird to me to state that the purpose of the study is to validate a television viewing scale. I would rephrase it to say, for example, that the purpose is to confirm the need of reporting CFA on existing previously validated scales, by means of validating a television viewing scale (which is just a way to do it). I believe that the second part needs some strengthening. So far it just looks as a list of previous papers. What can we learn overall from them? What are the pitfalls that you try to overcome in your study? Finally, I think the paper would greatly benefit from some more detailed analysis of the implications of the results. What can you say about future possible lines of research emerging from your paper?	Changes were made according to reviewer comments. One paragraph has been added to explain how the work of Levine et al. (2006) complement the study (please see introductory section, last paragraph). Changes were made according to reviewer's comments., (please see introductory section, last paragraph, last sentence). Changes were made according to reviewer's comments., (please see lit.review section, last paragraph). More details have been added in the discussion and conclusion section.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are some typos (e.g. line 36 or 91) Sometimes the authors use the expression "et al." and sometimes "et al.," please unify the style. Please explain acronyms the first time they appear (e.g. SPM in line 210).	Expression has been unify for the study. Acronyms has been explained



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Lines 119 - 123 is a repetition of lines 102-105	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		