



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	1. In "Abstract" the word "review" (paper) should not be used, because it suggests paper's evaluation. 2. "Introduction": it should be shortened and strictly focused on the issue/topic of the paper. Introduction contains too many general descriptions, especially from the lines 34-44 which could be, at last, shortened if not deleted. 3. In "Methodology" author refers on "literature survey", but doesn't give any literature overview. It is a must; author should write literature overview with selection of the most important literature he used in research, and explanation why selected literature is relevant for this paper. 4. "Table 1": missing complete data for the year 2011. If those data lacks, it should be explained why. 5. "Table 2": I am introduced with problems collecting data, especially from state institutions (government, local and municipal authorities, etc.), but still lack of any data should be explained. 6. "Heterogeneity of agritourism": the Italian best practice examples for all categories/types of agritourism should be quoted/mentioned. 7. I suggest that unpublished documents quoted in the	OK – I have eliminated the word, as suggested Other Reviewers want it longer. The literature and unpublished papers are distributed throughout the text. The list appears in the References. I have added a footnote I have added a footnote 6) The various typologies are listed and described in the paragraph. There is no need to



SDI Review Form 1.6

	text should be included in “References”. 8. “3.4 Institutional involvement and development”: I suggest that author when discusses about Italian agritourism associations include in References their web page links that could provide more information about them to potential interested readers. 9. “3.6 Problems and perspectives”: the problems and perspectives should be more diversified, first problems, than perspectives, because in present form both are too overlapped and not clear enough. 10. “4. Conclusion”: First two paragraphs of “Conclusion” should better fit in “Introduction” and they unnecessary repeating already stated in “Abstract” and “Introduction”. Also, they are common places which repeat several times already mentioned, and they should be avoided in discussion that needs more focused and high lightened statements. Also, “Conclusion” has segments that could better fit in the chapter 3.6. Products and Perspectives”. Chapter “Conclusion” made impression that doesn’t organically belong to the body of the article, since I couldn’t find enough strong, logical connection with the “Discussion and Results”. I suggest that author re-write and better structure conclusion remarks which will follow analysed paper subject on more appropriate way.	repeat them in a list. 7) The guidelines for authors impose what I did. 8) I have added the web pages. 9) I have cut something and moved some parts. 10. I have moved some paragraphs.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	In logical structure of the paper issue, I suggest that author think to relocate paragraph “3.4 Institutional involvement and development” before paragraphs 3.1., 3.2, and 3.3.	The other 4 reviewers did not suggest any structural modifications, but I accept this suggestion.
Optional/General comments	In general, paper consists of too many generally known facts without emphasizing and elaborating the most specific and important phenomena of Italian agritourism that could have better value and interest for foreign scholarly readers. Regarding above mentioned, I could not classify subjected paper higher than Professional paper.	Ok. Ok