SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEBA_53475**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The Impact of Sponsorship on Brand Equity of Cellular Networks in Hyderabad Pakistan**
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	In general, attractive and beneficial research subject. The author(s) were very clear in their research plan. But the manuscript needs major proof reading [see suggested changes in attached corrected manuscript] The abstract is clear and provides clear introduction to the parts of the paper in a concise and organized manner The introduction is adequate for the research on hand, and the references cited are appropriate and current. However, many of these citations are not reported in the List of references which creates a problem of unethical use of Inflation of Citations. If added this is solved… It is satisfactory to tie the title, the abstract and the literature itself to the methodology and later on to the discussions The methodology is very clear and adequate. Though details needed to be adjusted [see attached corrected manuscript] Results are clear but needed a major rewriting [see suggested changes in attached manuscript] The discussion is adequately presented Conclusion is adequate responding to the research objectives but needs to be validated by referring to other researchers Major Proofreading is needed. See suggested corrected manuscript in detail. Problem with references: 1. References need to be reviewed carefully to be consistent according to the Journal Citation style 2. Add all missing Intext citations to the list 3. Either remove extra references [marked in RED] or add them to the text	The Reviewer has checked the manuscript with steady and focused approach with an in-depth analysis. It was impressive to see the objections and amendments raised by the reviewer. It was really a good experience after observing and making corrections in the manuscript. Finally, we thank to reviewer for the positive remarks and feedback about our efforts in the paper.
Optional/General comments	Copy of Corrected manuscript is attached.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

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)* Yes, because of not mentioning the Intext citations in the List of references… When done this is solved….	