



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_10300
Title of the Manuscript:	Differences in perceptions among managers, academics, and students of the importance of various aspects of marketing knowledge and skills
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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 <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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	(1) The authors should provide in the Introduction section two brief paragraphs, that should elaborate the academic-oriented marketing: One paragraph should succinctly state the structure of the “marketing mix” and its 4, or 7, or 8 P’s, accordingly. There exists a plethora of relevant studies and the authors should follow the most convenient/familiar to their revised study. The other paragraph should also denote the components of a “360° marketing” approach. Particularly, the authors should be concentrated on the shifts and the integrated paths of this approach. It should be also welcome, in case that the authors add one Figure per each approach, too. (2) The empirical and in-field capabilities of a marketing approach in the market are satisfactorily presented in the experimental section. Indeed, the questionnaire tool is appropriately shown: a) the orientation and the capabilities/priorities of the marketable approach of marketing, as well as	I have added two brief paragraphs with two figures marketing mix 4P and 360° marketing concept. I agree.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	b) the potential deviation of in-field marketing from the academic marketing goals. Therefore, the authors should provide in the Conclusions and Implications section a Table with four compartments, stating the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Strengths of empirical marketing. The content of each compartment should be no more of two or three notions, while the authors should compare-and-contrast this information by comparing empirical findings to theoretical foundations, if applicable. These SWOT characteristics are sparsely presented throughout the text, and this Table inclusion should gather them, thus maximize the innovative elements of the authors' work and reveal the dominant parameters of: a) Future studies, according to the authors' expertise and affiliation to the Slovenian area. b) Enhance the replication of their study to the same topic at other regions, accordingly.	I don't agree with reviewer this time. I believe that this does not fall within the content of the paper.
Minor REVISION comments	The authors should scrutinize thoroughly their initial manuscript, in order to correct sporadic errors in the English syntax, where applicable. Besides, the authors should check the correctness of Heading-Subheadings' matching and re-number them, where appropriate.	I have done. I have done.
Optional/General comments		