

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_98723
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Sponsor-Event Congruence on Sponsor Credibility, Attitude toward the Sponsor, and Purchase Intention: A Study of Implora Brand
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:

(<https://www.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	The manuscript is important for scientific community in bringing new knowledge in the relationship between sponsor-event congruence, sponsor credibility, attitude toward the sponsor and purchase intention. The title is suitable. The abstract is comprehensive. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript is scientifically sound. The references are sufficient and recent. Conclusion part is a section for wrapping-up the study. It is less appropriate to mention the t-value for each variable (as it rather be in the Results section) and discussing the comparisons of findings between past research and the current research there.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
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:	Siti Haslina Md Harizan
Department, University & Country	School of Distance Education, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia