



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_52364
Title of the Manuscript:	BRAND TRUST AND BRAND LOYALTY: A MODERATION AND MEDIATION PERSPECTIVE
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The paper is very interesting and novel and I think it could be published, but the author might consider the following questions before publication</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -A table that includes similar studies carried out to date could improve the theoretical framework -A better justification of hypotheses (H2) and (H3) same as (H1) would be adequate. "Brand Trust on brand commitment", "Brand commitment and brand loyalty". <p>There are too many old references that are used. Newer references must be included. Otherwise it implies that no other work has been carried out since then.</p> <p>Figure 1 is not referred to in the text.</p> <p>There is lack of discussion on the constructs chosen. Why these constructs? How chosen?</p> <p>There is also lack of discussion on the questionnaire design. Where did the items come from? It would be good to have a table (constructs, items, source of reference). Be transparent and declare explicitly which item taken from which source unless all the same items are stated in all the sources.</p> <p>Conclusion and managerial implication should be together " conclusion and managerial implication</p> <p>Table 2 indicate " indicator , items , factor loadings..... and so on there.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Michael Kwamega
Department, University & Country	College of Management, Sichuan Agricultural University, China