



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJEMT_16998
Title of the Manuscript:	THE CORRELATION BETWEEN BUSINESS LOCATION AND CONSUMERS PATRONAGE: IMPLICATIONS FOR BUSINESS POLICY DECISIONS
Type of the 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 paper studies the effect of business locations on consumer's repeat-purchases and evaluates the effect of proximity of business locations on consumer's patronage. The study was implemented through a questionnaire that collected data on the use of a photocopying service in an university. The conclusions are that business location influences performance and repeat purchases of consumers. The paper is well written, carefully motivated and reveals knowledge of the related literature. However, the way the study is conducted and the employed methodology are poor and unsophisticated, what raises doubts on the robustness and relevance of the results. The paper can be considered for publication in light of its correctness and careful preparation, but it must be noted that it delivers no significant new result to the scientific literature in the field.	This has been noted and your views will be accommodated in our future papers.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The inclusion of a small conclusion with a synthesis of the main results would be helpful.	The conclusion and synthesis of the main results has been taken care of in the paper in line with your suggestions.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		