



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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Section 1 Introduction • The aims of the paper could be included in this section. • Line 21: base year and source are missing. • Line 28: Please specify what kind of income (such as from Agriculture, or family income ...) Section 3 Results and discussions • table 1 some data is missing, why? The adopted concept of turnover must be specified (there are many definitions of turnover) and commented. • a comparison with the European average could usefully be introduced in this section • Table 2 is missing the source, is not explained (and even commented) the index (last column of the table) • Table 3: year is missing • The sentence (lines 337-338) should be	I have added a few lines It was the same as other data.. I have added the reference, but is a repetition. Line 28 : Income for farmers, from agro tourism = sale of hospitality (rooms, apartments and food, and services). I have explained as footnote of Table 1 Definition of turn over? I do not agree. Should I also explain "flatland" or "mountain" or "teacher"?? Impossible – within EU there are incomes too different, no comparison is feasible. I have added the sources of data. Index has Italy as base = 100. Table 3 – ok I have included the date Ok, thanks for the suggestions.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	changed. It contains some inaccuracies. I suggest: Since 1985 (not 1980) Integrated Mediterranean programs (not projects) and then with the reform or structural policy in 1988 (Objective 1 and Objective 5b and the Community Initiative Leader) • In section 3.5 there are discrepancies. In Table 5, the days of stay do not match with the average stay in Table 6 and the author does not explain the reasons. • Lack the statistical comparison and trend with other businesses of the day stay. The last sentence of paragraph 3.5 must be supported by official surveys. The author, finally, includes in the text and in support of different statements numerous documents and research unpublished research that are not included in the references	3.5: Yes – I have corrected I could not make more tables for each different category. These are not surveys, but normal collection of data. I have added the reference. I have followed the instructions, which say that unpublished documents must be fully mentioned within the text and not listed in the references.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		