



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
1. 1. Introduction. Author states that "Italy is the only country in Europe with specific laws regulating agritourism". This is incorrect, for instance, Croatia also has specific laws that determine agritourism. My suggestion is to re-formulate this first paragraph of the Introduction or, at last, determine which part of Europe author captures in his researches. 2. 3.1. Institutional involvement and development. Lines 200-202: I suggest author to include referenced author and his/her work in References. (The same is in the paragraph 3.3. Farmers' motivations, lines 306-308). 3. 3.2. Heterogeneity of agritourism. To emphasize paragraph's significance, the various typologies should be listed at first, as well as described on appropriate way in the further text. 4. Even author declined my suggestion to add really very short literature overview, with the explanation that "the literature and unpublished papers are distributed throughout the text", I still insist that literature overview, as a short, consisted paragraph is a must to have more clearly and understandable overviewed situation about the problem in general. I again suggest that author should write literature overview as an independent paragraph with selection of the most important and/or recent literature he used in research, and explanation why selected literature is relevant for this paper. 5. 4. Conclusion. I gave remarks and suggestions how author could structure and improve Conclusion, but author just moved one paragraph of the Conclusion and left other text as it was in previous version of the paper. Still, Conclusion doesn't have structure and weight that could have as the final part of one research paper, and I am staying on my previous reviews and remarks how Conclusion could be arranged and re-write better.	Another Reviewer wanted me to state this point. Answering to FIVE Reviewers is quite complicated. I have changed with European Union. Croatia will stay out of EU in the next months. Cannot do – The guidelines for authors say that unpublished papers must be fully mentioned in the text. NOT in the references. Ok – I did it. I have also added a reference to organic farming, because this could be new for some readers. To avoid further discussion, I have included the numbers of references in this paragraph. BUT I confirm my total disagreement about this point. This part should contain only references to methodological aspects - such a handbook of statistics, if the case, or of sociological research methods, or analytical methods for chemical experiments, but this is not my case. Listing some references and repeating them again along the text is not correct. I had to combine comments from 5 reviewers. Not an easy task. Nobody else criticized the conclusions. I moved something because it was required by another reviewer. I have now also added a few lines at the very end. I find hard to write other things.