



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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments Title: Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	Agritourism in Italy. Evolution, Situation and Perspectives 1. Introduction: It's better to clarify with major literature about definition agritourism in Italy and in the world. In the literature there is a great variety of terminology, sometimes with different meanings. It's important to clarify that Italy is the only country in the European Union that has specific laws regulating agritourism, whereas elsewhere this particular type of accommodation is included in the more general sector of rural tourism.	Ok. I have added a few lines.
Methodology (Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)	It's a descriptive analysis but there isn't an original methodology.	I have written that it is a review paper, based on publications, unpublished papers and own experiences.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)	The paper is too much long in some parts it's need to synthesize (lanes 68-83; paragraphs 3.1 and 3.2 better together; lanes 294-301). There are some repetitions 1. Yes 2. lanes 158- 163 ...didactic or teaching farms aren't a "very special segment"... but a specialization of agritourism. It should be explained further. Have you a source? Lanes 175-181 About organic agritourism farms you should to indicate a source about definition and data. To see Privitera, in APSTRACT, 2010 3. Table 2. Probably it's better a figure. Lane 410 Why the best performance was shown by the five star hotel? Have you a source? 4. Yes	None of the other 4 reviewers suggested to cut. I do not think wise to merge 3.1 with 3.2, since they focus different aspects. It's a matter of what we intend for "segment", but I have accepted the suggestion and modified. Added one source. Added one source I left the table. It is explained in the following paragraph: better marketing, more promotion, more international connections.
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	About agritourism: Greffe, 1992; Lane, 1994; Bramwell, 1994; Seaton et al. 1994; Phillip et al. 2010 About Authenticity MacCannell, 1973; 1976; Urry, 1995; Sharpley 1994; etc.	Most suggested references are quite old. The one by Phillip et. al., appeared in Tourism management, I did not find of special interest. There are zillions of articles about agri-tourism, and I did my choices, to select the few ones I found interesting.
Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)	Lane 469 Agritourism is also sustainable tourism but it's not the same. It's better to note the difference . It should be explained further. Lanes 489-499 They aren't conclusions but problems and perspectives (paragraph 3.6) Lanes 499-507 It's better when you tell about organic agritourism farms (lanes 175-181)	I was writing about economic sustainability of agritourism, not about sustainable tourism. But I have specified better. Thanks. Accepted – and moved. Accepted and moved, as suggested.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Lanes 34-44 Please indicate the source. Lane 44 It should explain what the tourist intended for authenticity (MacCannell, 1973; 1976; Urry, 1995; Sharpley 1994; etc.) Table 3. It not indicated the year. Table 4. To improve the title Table 6. It's not necessary because it's explained in the text.	I did it I do not think it is necessary. It's an article about economics and organization, not about perceptions or philosophy of food / lifestyles, but I changed the word with "life". I did it I tried It also gives data not commented. None of other four Reviewers suggested to eliminate it.
General comments	My impression of the paper is that is a nice paper, about an issue that is topical and important with its entrepreneurship opportunities. Nice statistical results but some tables aren't necessary. Needs some language corrections before being published because is a little too technical.	Thanks. It is difficult to satisfy the requirements / suggestions by five, sometimes conflicting, Reviewers.