



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_19020
Title of the Manuscript:	Managing Corporate Identity Risk as a Strategic Indicator on Organizational Performance
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	1) Very big abstract! 2) Very short introduction. There is not analogy with the abstract. 3) Very big and so much theoretically the third part, from 111 till 492 lines. 4) How the author chose the sample? With systematic sampling, with random sampling, some other methodology? 5) The Table 1 must be in findings and not in the conclusions. 6) There is no serious statistical analysis. 7) There is no any econometric analysis. The methodology is not motivated by the theory.	Table 1 has established in Finding Section. Our abstract has organized according to our research problem as scientific article. Our introduction has required length and also it has sufficient content. This is serious research and good research article which includes strong author team. We believe that our research has strong analysis. Methodology is consistent with our theory. We have designed our paper according to critics which we agreed ones. Regards, for reviewers.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		