



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_11311
Title of the Manuscript:	How Corporate Social Responsibility influences Customer Repurchases Intentions, Customer Word-of-Mouth Intentions and Customer Perceived Food Quality of Fast-food Restaurants in Hong Kong: the mediating effects of Corporate Reputation
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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	The title should be replaced as "How Does Corporate Social Responsibility influence Customer Repurchases Intentions, Customer Word-of-Mouth Intentions and Customer Perceived Food Quality of Fast-food Restaurants in Hong Kong? The mediating effects of Corporate Reputation"	The authors agreed with the comment that the title is a little strange and needs a better description. The authors proposed to change to: "The influences of Corporate Social Responsibility to Customer Repurchases Intentions, Customer Word-of-Mouth Intentions and Customer Perceived Food Quality of Fast-food Restaurants in Hong Kong and the mediating effects of Corporate Reputation"
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-The word corporation in line 149 should be replaced as <i>corporate</i>. -The sentences in line 255-256, 260-261, 262-263 should be added the source of which are they drawn from. -The sentence in line 278-279, <i>"The success of CSR activities is reflected in the positive reputation of the retailer, which results in positive WoM intentions, positive RPI and positive PFQ"</i> should be supported theoretically. The source should be added after that sentence.	Revised, thanks. The authors agreed with the comments, so - sources have been added to 255-256. - sources have been added to 260-261 - sources have been added to 262-263 Thanks for the comments. The original mind of the authors in writing this sentence was not to quote the previous studies, instead the authors wanted to study the relationships of the constructs mentioned in this sentence through this research. So this sentence has been re-written.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	-The hypotheses H5-H6-H7 at the lines 304-305 should be supported theoretically. Related citations should be added for that line. -The sentence in line 368-369, "<i>As all these constructs are abstract in nature, they are best measured by using an interval measurement scale</i>" is unnecessary. It should be omitted. -The sampling procedures should be explained more understandable. A total of 20 locations were selected randomly but the sampling technique of 400 respondents was unclear. Selection of these people was Randomly or conveniently? This part should be arranged more structured and logical. -The word theses in line 385 should be replaced as <i>these</i>. -The title in line 597 should be revised as <i>Discussion and Implications</i>	The citations have been added to support H5, H6 and H7. The authors agreed with the comments. This sentence was removed from the revised manuscript. Thanks for the comments. Both the 20 locations and the 400 respondents were randomly selected. Those necessary words have been added in the revised manuscript. Done. Done.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The subject matter of the research problem is highly appreciable and relevant to the theme of the journal. The structured is good and the method use is well organised. It will surely make a contribution to the relevant field of research. Also, the presentation of thoughts in the paper is notable. The paper is good enough for publication with minor corrections.	Thanks for the comments.