



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_14433
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of Channel Relationship Management on the Channel Partners of Telecom Industry- A Case Study of Reliance Communications in Western Uttar Pradesh Circle, India
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Overall: The MS is well-written Proposed concept and strategies are good and novel Study is adequately performed Short-comings are indicated Findings & Conclusions are OK The MS describes and explicitly identifies a particular commercial enterprise (RELIANCE). Material in page 3: RELIANCE COMMUNICATIONS IN BRIEF. It should however be removed. The reasons are as follows: In open-publications, avoiding explicit descriptive (either in praise of or condemning) a particular commercial/corporate structure in vogue is not ethical. This reviewer is at loss relevant to the context of this paper - who cares about knowing the origin and history behind RELIANCE! Possibly, the author is an employee of RELIANCE (or its affiliations) and so writes the section in page 3. If this is just to curry the favour of his/her corporation, then the general professionalism is at stake! The author should skip using the name of the corporation and say, generally, that the information furnished is pertinent to a private sector service provider. Avoid using the acronym Rcom also. Just call it as the	Thanks for the appreciation. I have removed the section of RCOM in brief from the Manuscript and added the rationale of the study in it. RATIONALE OF THE STUDY This paper explicates that a marketing channel acts as a differentiating factor and provides businesses with a competitive advantage. Marketing channels comprise several individuals and interdependent organizations that facilitate the process of making a product or service available to end users. Channel members play a dominant role in moving products across the marketing channel. They also perform the role of sorting, making transactions routine and contractual efficiency. In addition, marketing channels perform several functions. These involve all activities that facilitate the flow of products from the manufacturer to the end user. As the product moves through different stages, different members in the distribution channel perform the functions of exchange, logistics and other supporting functions.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	incumbent provider assessed or some proxy name like that. Similarly use proxy names for other corporations , distributors etc. (e.g. for FMCG) Construct a pseudocode on the various statistical computations involving V1, V2 etc	Companies can develop their own distribution channels or delegate the functions to different channel members through channel integration and enhance channel relationship management. Channel integration involves streamlining the different channel activities and information flow in a manner that leads to mutual benefits to all the partners concerned. The advantages of channel relationship management (CRM) are manifold. It reduces transaction costs, improves inventory management, reduces business opportunism, acts as a barrier to new entrants, bridges the time, space, and variety gaps between production and consumption and reduces the business opportunities lost due to stock-outs and delayed delivery. However, in the second part I don't agree with the reviewer's comment that I should change the name of the company or put attempt to hide it or make it a general case. Because the whole research is specifically done with Reliance Communication Distributors and retailers and managers. So this detailed study can't be diluted at all by
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		deleting the name of the company. Thirdly the acronym is used just to avoid the formatting errors and the reason also is clearly stated in the manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	NIL	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This reviewer expects the above revisions without fail Ethical Issues: Yes. Unless the corporate names indicated are removed	I don't agree that the corporate name should be removed. Because the permission was taken before conducting a research on this company.