

Reviews of ECONJOURNAL-D-23-00021R2

Bridging Brand Parity with Insights Regarding Consumer Behavior

Reviewer 1

The work is not grounded on any established theory. n information processing theory was mentioned but unfortunately I fail to see how this was applied in the manuscript.

The other issues raised by the previous reviewers seem to be addressed although it would be in the interest of readability to pass the work through a content reviewer to resolve the grammar and language used in the manuscript.

Reviewer 2

There is an impression that the concept of microeconomics has been forced into the skeleton of the article. The concept of microeconomics in the title of the article does not reflect its content. The topic and problem of the article could be better expressed without the concept of microeconomics. The article is related to the field of marketing science. The scope and context of consumer behavior, which the field of marketing science focuses on, and the consumer theory of microeconomics are quite different from the specific to the general. It is possible to examine consumer behavior within the framework of microeconomics in many different dimensions than what is discussed in this article, but this article does not have the content to set microeconomics as the upper context. A phrase like "microeconomic behavior of consumers" is a concept that neither marketing nor economics defines.

However, the overall theme of the article is logically developed and the article is appropriately subdivided and sub-headed. If the concept of microeconomics is removed, the sub-headings are clear and informative enough.

"Regarding the relationship between brand parity and brand loyalty, there are few and contradictory studies in the literature (e.g. Li, 2010; Iyer and Muncy, 2005)." What is the gap in the literature expressed in this sentence? The author should define this gap more clearly. How was this gap discovered? How this gap will be closed should be explained in detail.

What exactly the research problem is and how it is derived should be more clearly explained, convincingly defined and well argued.

The choice of study material and methodological approach is appropriate, adequate and feasible. The discussion section should be further developed.

Reviewer 3

Although the writers spent a lot of work on their research article and the topic is fascinating, there are substantial problems with the study.

First and foremost, native English speakers should revise and proofread this content. Second, because all the variables have already been examined in great detail in other studies, this paper does not significantly advance the body of knowledge. Third, Keller (2013) takes brand loyalty into account at the top of his brand resonance pyramid model, which has four sub-dimensions, according to this paper's authors. I'm not sure if it was intended to be written twice or not by the authors, but it should be double checked.

As a result, this study needs to be completely revised, and it should make the case for why this study is superior to others.

Please check the Pdf. document to see my comments.