

Dear esteemed colleagues,

In my opinion, this is an overall interesting and well-structured paper on a subject currently of great fascination like the action and power of brands on eastern Asian markets. I do highly appreciate the authors' effort to balance classic studies with new scholars and qualitative research. It results in a properly focused work, based both on noteworthy authorities (timely and generously quoted) and on a well angled overlook on evidences. Never drifted away by personal point of view. Subject is clearly explained and very well organized and discussed, from abstract to conclusions, especially on the anthropological and sociological level. A future improvement under the point of view of economic issues and effects could be not only very interesting and stimulating, but also recommended. Regarding the technical quality of the paper, there are some typos and other minor textual problems that need attention before publication, such as: - pg. 6 line 8: citation lacks of one date after Jung (Freud 1912, Jung: Levy-Strauss 1968-69) - pg. 3 line 18, pg. 4 line 14, pg. 5 line 6, pg. 13 line 20: witch instead of which - pg. 7 line 14: valerian instead of values - pg. 11 line 18: bands instead of brands - pg. 18, index of figures: figure 5 wrongly referred to pg. 20 instead of pg. 10. With reference to the citations, I'd like to say that, even if a few of them can be felt as redundant (pg. 3 line 2 and pg. 10 line 7), I won't absolutely suggest cutting them off, 'since they can better guide less skilled readers along the path of comprehension and autonomous in-depth analysis. With reference to the data mentioned, summarized and evaluated in the results of the questionnaires (i.e. Qualitative Research 1 at pg. 5 and Qualitative Research 2 at pg. 11), I wish I had found more details about quantitative research. Only depending on my personal point of view and debating style, I can warmly recommend adding and illustrating (even if briefly, of course) quantitative data collected and analysed as basis of the authors' generalizations. In my opinion, the overall scientific quality is definitely notable and technical quality is far and away above average. I'm fine with adopted working methodology, findings and limitations. Good piece of work. I'd grade its scientific value around 90 out of 100 and its technical quality around 80 out of 100.