



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_6297
Title of the Manuscript:	An Empirical Determination of Customers' Perception of the Advertising Slogan –“ New” or “New improved” As Used by Low Risk Brand Marketers.

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The paper should be published after the following adjustments: 1. The topic should be adjusted thus: 'An Empirical Determination of Customers' in Lagos Mainland Perception of the Advertising Slogan-“New or New improved” As Used by Low Risk Brand Marketers' 2. The abstract should be adjusted as a continuous prose without sub-headings see attached revised abstract for adoption. 3. Line 121 should be adjusted thus: Literature Review. 4. Line 178 see (p.22) should be properly referenced. 5. Line 282; tell us the method used in selecting 40 respondents from each of the ten localities in Lagos Mainland. 6. Line 300 should be adjusted thus: Results and Discussion. 7. Line 349, should be adjusted thus: Test of Hypotheses, line 351 - (P<0.000) should be adjusted to reflect your table t-value of 3 thus: -(P<3.000). 8. Line 372, discussion and conclusion should be deleted. 9. Line 413, insert Conclusion and Recommendations. 10. Check your referencing, there are not in line with SDI template e.g. 1996, pp. 1-18. 11. Check your fonts and size to ensure that there are in line with SDI template.	1. The suggested title is grammatically wrong and unwieldy. We would rather have the title adjusted to read: 'An Empirical Determination of Customers' Perception of the Advertising Slogan-“New” or “New improved” On Low Risk Brands in Lagos, Nigeria.' See line 4 page 1 2. This suggestion contradicts the SDI format for abstract. Please see template. Therefore, we stick with the abstract format as earlier adjusted. However, lines 12-29 (page 1) of the abstract have further been adjusted. 3. This has been done as suggested (see line 121 on page 4) 4. The (p.22) in line 178 on page 5 has been removed as suggested. 5. Please see line 280 for the sampling technique. There is no need to repeat that again in line 282. Please note that there is a sampling procedure called convenience sampling which is a member of non-probability sampling technique. 6. Line 300(page 8) has been adjusted as suggested. 7. The caption in line 349 (page 12) has been changed as suggested. Line 351 needs no adjustment because the decision rule here is based on the P values (<0.000) returned by SPSS for each of the hypothesis which are less than 0.05 the significance value chosen ex-ante. It is not standard practice to report an arbitrary test value. The other possible route to making this decision would have been to compare the t-computed with t-value table in which case it would be mandatory to report both the t-value computed and the t-value table. Please note that 3 is the test value and not the value of the t test computed. For more on P-value and hypothesis testing please see <i>Business Research Methods (10th Edition)</i> by Cooper & Schindler and, <i>Quantitative Methods For Decision Makers (4th Edition)</i> by Mik Wisniewski. 8. The caption: discussion and conclusion, has been deleted 9. 'Conclusion and recommendations' has been inserted in line 413 (page 14) 10. The references have been cleaned up using SDI template. 11. The fonts and size are in tandem with SDI template.