

Paper: **“Lifestyle as a Branding Strategy for the Sustainable Brand”**

**Submitted: 01 June 2023**

**Accepted: 15 August 2023**

**Published: 31 August 2023**

Corresponding Author: Giancarlo Scozzese

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n22p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Arlen Ceron

UAEH – ICEA, Mexico

Reviewer 2: Ioseb Gabelaia

Transport and Telecommunication Institute, Latvia

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

-----  
Reviewer D:  
Recommendation: Resubmit  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

Yes, it is clear and adequate to the content.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract does not clearly show objectives, methods and conclusions. It is not appreciated that it is an article with a methodological contribution.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

In this section, repeated words and writing in the first person are observed.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

This section does not observe the type of methodology that was used, the way in which the sample was selected; only a brief description of the instrument is made. No specifications of the type of method and the methodology used

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The theoretical framework is very extensive.  
A section of objectives is included, which must go in methodology and/or abstract  
The results presented are only a descriptive analysis

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The conclusions are accurate, however they do not provide the most important content of the article.  
The language used is not depersonalized.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The references used are very outdated, it is suggested to view more current articles from at least 10 years ago. Only 30% of these are current. Approve your presentation  
Not all citations are referenced

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Return for major revision and resubmission

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

It is recommended that greater importance be given to the contribution of the research, not to the theoretical review. It is a scientific article whose main objective is to highlight the methodology, analysis, results and/or contributions (discussion).

-----

-----  
Reviewer O:  
Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title of the work is slightly blurry. Maybe it would have been better to state scientifically "the Impact of lifestyle on a branding strategy for the sustainable brand". Something along those lines. Especially, the authors have conducted the quant research, and it would have been good to see correlations and relationships between the groups of IVs and DV

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

It would be recommended to the authors to state the research methodology, findings, and results in the abstract, so readers know what to expect. In current abstract it is not mentioned, not even in introduction.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Not an English expert, however, I would advise authors to review one more time the manuscript for minor issues. If they have an opportunity to allow native speaker to review it, would be even better.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

"In order to explore the relationships that connect critical consumers with a sustainable brand, a survey was conducted using a questionnaire structured in such a way as to obtain a psychographic segmentation of basic personality traits, values, and beliefs, and to explain the relationship that exists between product-personality-

scenario in light of this". My suggestion to the authors would be to reduce the literature review and allow to have more explaining about methods and processes.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The body of the paper is well organized, however, I would want to see structure such as:

Introduction

Literature review with sub-headings

Research methods and Methodology with sub-headings

Findings and results

Conclusions

This structure would allow authors to have well organized and structured submission. They have all elements in the paper, but I would like it to be organized this way.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

Yes, but the conclusions would have been stronger if the authors would have a mode of SPSS analysis of the data.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

References are comprehensive and Appropriate.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the **BODY** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the **CONCLUSION** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the **REFERENCES** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Dear authors,

Please re-structure your abstract. Add some information about methods, and results. It would be good to have it in advance so readers understand your work from the beginning.

Second, please organize the paper structurally such as - an introduction - literature review with sub-headings, research methods, and methodologies that need more explanation, also if possible apply SPSS analysis, it will allow your work and results to be strong.

-----

-----  
Reviewer Q:  
Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The Italian context should be mentioned.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Nothing on methods and results. Only theory.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

A few.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Clear.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

Clear.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

Low quality analysis, therefore the conclusions are poor.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

More international references are needed.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Return for major revision and resubmission

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Very interesting and up-to-date theoretical analysis.  
Good summary of literature, it is however strongly focused on Italian sources.



The theoretical part promises much more than the research section.  
The questionnaire is to improve, since a neutral approach of certain questions could decrease the distortion resulted from the first person statements.  
The statistical analysis does not go beyond the descriptive frequencies. As a minimum the segment-specific significances should be studied as well.  
It is important to underline that due to the direct questioning the responses are not more than stated preferences with a probably high level of distortion.  
The research part has to be developed based on the review. A few grammatical problems need a final proofreading.

-----

-----  
Reviewer R:  
Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title explains clearly the content and the methodology

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract is clear and rich of details

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

no grammatical errors

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

It's explained clearly and appropriate to the behavior under consideration

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The body of the paper is clear

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The results of the paper are fluid; needs only a little implementation about future managerial implications

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

More updated references are appreciated

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

-----