



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_7104
Title of the Manuscript:	Consumers' Loyalty to bottled Water Brands in Nigeria: An empirical Study
Type of the Article	Original 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	- Although the measurement scales used for this study were based on a theoretical framework, it is strongly recommended that the author provides a good explanation of the empirical approach that was followed to ensure the data obtained would be valid. - Also, it is questionable whether a 1-item measurement scale can be used to reach conclusions on brand loyalty. - The explanation of the results in the Abstract section is also unclear. It is suggested that the author explains the results of each category in a different sentence. - The contribution of this study to the industry must also be mentioned in the abstract. - Suggest change "loyalty" as a keyword to "consumer brand loyalty" - Section 1.7 (Brief literature review) – Author mentioned that according to "literature" there are at least ten brands of bottled water in Nigeria. Source must be cited. - The reporting of the ANOVA results needs further clarification. Firstly, the normal assumptions underlying the use of the ANOVA technique must be stated. Was the data normally distributed or at least mention that sample size was above 30. Also, was it possible to assume equal variance? Table II needs further clarification. Meaning of "A", "B" and "C" are not clear. Show group comparisons with relevant p values. - Some of the references used are very outdated and motivation must be given why they were used. - The significance of the study to the industry (rationale) must be addressed in the introduction and problem statement section of the manuscript. - Table IIIB and IIIC makes reference to the income and age levels of the respondents. Income and age were not measured in the questionnaire provided in Annexure A.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer