



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_6318
Title of the Manuscript:	Examine the effects of customer satisfaction on customer loyalty: An empirical study in the healthcare insurance industry in Hong Kong
Type of the Article	Research 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	Support and arguments for the causal relationships between customer satisfaction and customer loyalty should be further strengthened. Mediating effects may need more evidence (e. g. H7, 8, 9) In general, this is a paper ready to be accepted. Interesting subject, Good literature review, acceptable research structure and research method, and good writing and implications.	More arguments are added to support their relationship. Structural equation modelling (SEM) is a powerful and common analytical tool in evaluating direct and mediating effects of different constructs. So the analytic results obtained in this paper by using SEM is sufficiently to support the hypotheses H&, H8 and H9.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Vertical lines in tables should be deleted. Too many tables retard smooth reading. Instead of showing as a table, some tables may be described in the text, for example, tables 6, 7, 9, (and 13, 14) Orders of authors in in-text reference?	In order to simplify the presentation of results, tables 6, 7 and 9 are removed but their results are described in the text. The authors prefer to retain tables 13 and 14 because they gave a clearer and better presentation of results obtained. Order of authors in in-text reference is revised according to the journal guidelines.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Title of tables typically are placed on the top (Please refer to the guidelines of the journal)	Titles of tables are placed on the top of table according to the journal guidelines.
---	---	--