

Paper: “Do People Perceive Products Differently when Buying for Self Versus for Others? Malleable Brand Personality in Gifting”

Submitted: 22 August 2023

Accepted: 06 October 2023

Published: 31 October 2023

Corresponding Author: Fiona Sussan

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n28p27](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n28p27)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nasreen Khan
SZABIST University, Dubai, UAE

Reviewer 2: Milan Radosevic
Faculty of Technical Sciences, Novi Sad, Serbia

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

| | |
|--|--|
| Reviewer Name: Dr Nasreen Khan | |
| University/Country: SZABIST University, Dubai, UAE. | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 06/09/2023 | Date Review Report Submitted: 06/09/2023 |
| Manuscript Title: Do people perceive products differently when buying for self-versus for others? Malleable Brand Personality in Gifting | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0910/23 | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes | |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes | |
| You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes | |

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

| <i>Questions</i> | <i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|--|--|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 4 |
| <i>The title is adequate.</i> | |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 3 |
| <i>(The abstract should be more focused. The first sentence can be rewritten. Before mentioning the gap of research, one more sentence can be added which explains the concepts and proposed association between the variables. Also the last sentence seems incomplete. Keywords should reflect the main terms of the topic.)</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 3.5 |
| <i>(Grammar check is recommended)</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 3 |
| <i>(More clarity is recommended. Also the first paragraph under Data and Methodology can be shifted to the Literature review section)</i> | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 3 |
| <i>(H1 does not seem to be reflecting in the conceptual framework. How H1 is framed? How it was measured should be clearly mentioned.)</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| <i>(Fairly done)</i> | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

| | |
|--|--|
| Accepted, no revision needed | |
| Accepted, minor revision needed | |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | |
| Reject | |

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper requires structuring and specific details should be included as mentioned in the comment. Conceptual framework should be supported with literature .

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

| | |
|--|--|
| Reviewer Name: Milan Radošević | |
| University/Country: University Business Academy in Novi Sad | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 13.09.2023 | Date Review Report Submitted: 23.09.2023 |
| Manuscript Title: Do people perceive products differently when buying for self-versus for others? Malleable Brand Personality in Gifting | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0910/23 | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes | |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes | |
| You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes | |

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

| <i>Questions</i> | <i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|--|---|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 4 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 4 |
| <i>It would be good to compare the results from paper with some previous researchs and with results from other countries in that field.</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| <i>Authors are encouraged to cite a paper from the ESJ journal if there is any from their field.</i> | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Accepted, no revision needed | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Accepted, minor revision needed | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Reject | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I recommend that the paper be accepted for publication. However, it would be good, that authors cite some papers from the ESJ journal.