Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJARR_68068**
Title of the Manuscript:	**THEORETICAL LINKAGE BETWEEN THEORIES OF SOCIAL COMPARISON, BRAND CONGRUENCE, SELF CONCEPT AND SOCIAL INDENTITY.**
Type of the Article	**Concept Paper**

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/journal/10/editorial-policy)

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	**The manuscript under review appears as a conceptual paper. Thus, author/s has/have to specifically care about the use of bibliographical references. So, for example, all references quoted along the text should be included in the final listing, but at the moment some of them are missed, as Brunelet et al. (1990), Turan (2015), or Snyder & Gangestad (1986).** **In a similar sense, all references included in the final listing should have been quoted somewhere in previous pages. No quoted references should be removed from the final listing, as those by Bruner et al (2001), Graeff (1996), Malhotra (1981), Sirgy (2018), Sirgy et al (1997), Steenkamp (2001), or Steenkamp et al. (1999).** **Additionally, dates and names should be the same in text and in the bibliographical section. At the moment, for example, the contribution by Abosag et al. is dated in 2020 in the text while in 2019 in the final listing, or the contribution by Tynan et al. is dated in 2009 in the text while in 2010 in the final listing. Regarding typing, Sirgy's name appears several times typed as "Sigry", and Eren-Erdogmus's name appears typed as Eren-Eren-Erdogmus.** **Finally, there are some contributions appearins as not alphabetically ordered in the final listing, as those by Hall-Phillips et al. (2016), or Shukla (2008, 2010 and 2011).**	Agreed with Reviewer and corrected and removed accordingly.
Minor REVISION comments	From a formal view, when quoting contributions by three authors, sometimes the locution "et al" is used, while in other cases all three names are mentioned. Author/s should try a unique and systematic criterion. Even when used contributions are relevant and adequate, there is a few number of quoted contributions dated in the most recent period (last five/three years). Consideration (and inclusion) of most updated references would add valour to the paper. Main section headings are numbered as 1.0, 2.0, etc. Numbering them as 1, 2, etc. would be more adequate. Then sub-sections (2.1, 2.2 …) are used in the second section, as well as sub-sub-sections (2.2.1 …). As being only a sub-sub-section in every sub-section, such procedure appears as non-appropriate (we should recur to a heading level only when there are two or more headings in such level).	Noted
Optional/General comments	The paper provides an interesting basis for future developments and research in the field.	Thanks

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	