



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJEMT_17438
Title of the Manuscript:	Will You Purchase Green Products? The Joint Mediating Impact of Environmental Concern and Environmental Responsibility on Consumers' Attitude and Purchase Intention.
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	Some general editing should be performed in order to improve the English writing. It is very difficult to follow the results presented in Table 3. Are these results from bivariate regressions? I'm assuming the symbols in the table are supposed to be abbreviations for the variables in Table 2, but it isn't clear what G.P.I. means. I understand the "Constructs" or variables are Likert scores. But, it isn't clear to me what specific questions were asked in the survey instrument, so I don't understand how to interpret the regression results. In Tables 3 and 4, are the errors intended to represent causality? If so, what proof can be provided that causality is indeed in the direction of the arrows. Some evidence of the causal direction is needed in order to test the hypotheses. How can a Durbin Watson statistic be used to assert that there is no multicollinearity? (And, why would it even be presented, given that the data here are not time-series observations or spatial data.)	Recommendations have been incorporated
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Many of the assertions are confusing, e.g., p. 11, lines 415-418.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The overall content is fine. The logic is sound. The literature review appears to be comprehensive. But, the writing is difficult to follow, the analysis needs improvement, and the presentation of the results needs much more work.	