



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEMT_46107</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The relationship between corporate social responsibility, food health and safety and corporate reputation in the fast-food restaurants in Hong Kong</b>
Type of the 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>)

**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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>It is very interesting topic. Fast food is known as junk food and often blamed for various health issues among people. On other hand CSR worked for social good. However, this paper ignored this contrasting dimension. The question arises that how to expect responsibility from someone who is blamed for irresponsible social behaviour. The paper would be more interesting and attractive if rational would build around 'CSR and its effects (positive/negative) from fast food restaurants (as society spoiler).' In other word society building from society spoilers.</p> <p>Adoption of scale items required more details. On what basis this study adopted few items and dropped others? Why chose these study to select for item selection?</p> <p>Also, in discussion section (third paragraph) it is written 'The last but not the least hypothesis H5' from nowhere this H5 appeared.</p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ali Hasaan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Research &amp; Advanced Studies IRAS, Pakistan</b>