



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_3558
Title of the Manuscript:	Agritourism for Rural Development in Italy, Evolution, Situation and Perspectives

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	In order to clarify the content of the paper, it could be appropriate to specify the objective of the paper in the introduction and in the abstract. Paper introduces interesting elements and information, but they are not always substantiated by data. There claims which could be agreed upon, but the relevant sources of information should be added so to strengthen the authors' claims (for example, lines: 119, 165, 177, 192, 205, 289, 328, 386, 399). Line 92-98: % do not seem correct. Did the author refer to annual increase? Table 2 – please add the source of data Table 4 should be inserted in paragraph 3.3 (and not in 3.4). In addition please check format of sources of info of table 4. Line 276 – please add the source of the info Line 290 – please add the source of the info Bibliographic references along the text are not consistent – please homogenise.	Ok I did it All figures and statements in the text have references. Or in a few cases they are based on my own expertise and knowledge. It is annual average growth. I have specified now. Thanks I did it Tables are inserted where it is possible. Depends on size and format of publication – sorry. Based on my experience and knowledge. The published references must be cited by number, whereas the unpublished ones must appear between brackets – it's in the instructions for authors. It was strange also for me.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 21 – please add source of data Line 23 – please specify fifth position of what. For tourism overall? Only agritourism? Line 30 – the mentioned source is published Line 33 – 34 – the passage between the two parts of the introduction could be smoother Table 1 could be inserted before line 100 Table 3 could be inserted before line 242 Par. 3.4; lines 337-342 – given the topic of the paper, data on Rural Development Plans could provide interesting information on the institutional involvement and financing on agritourism The paper should add information regarding role of women in managing agritourism On conclusion (par. 4): Information on agritourism classification (Ministry of Agriculture and ICEA) could be inserted in par. 3, and then further commented in the conclusion. Lines 471-476 – comments are clear. Is it possible to add information in the paper to support them? Line 557 – appendix: what does this refer to?	Is mentioned All tourism – I have explained it better. I do not think. Interested parties can however find it. It's a matter of styles. Tables are inserted where possible See line before Very few data are available about RDPs and agritourism. Dr. Pesce at INEA Italy is working on this. Could become another paper. Women and agri-tourism could be another paper, but not many data are available. I changed as suggested These aspects come from the unpublished papers I mentioned in the text No idea: it is in the format, but if I try to cancel / erase, the whole paper “explodes”...
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Interesting paper which provides an overview of the agritourism experience in Italy and an update of recent developments.	Thanks. I just wanted to share what is happening. It is not a “research” paper.