SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade**
Manuscript Number:	**2013_BJEMT_4481**
Title of the Manuscript:	**FACTORS INFLUENCING THE CHOICE OF WETLAND VALUATION METHODS IN THE NIGER DELTA, NIGERIA**
Type of the Article	**Research paper**

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 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment** The paper has 3 distinct sections which are not well integrated to develop a clear understanding of the findings or the implications of the findings. The first section of the paper (Introduction, Significance of Wetland, The Need for Valuation of Wetlands and Factors Responsible for the Choice of Wetland Valuation Method) is not well written and serves as a general overview of the role of non-market valuation. In particular the authors include some terms to represent the underlying economic theory, such as market failure, without really explaining what that means in the specific context of wetlands or even as applied to the region of Nigeria. In section 4 the authors present concepts of "impact analysis" "partial valuation" and "total valuation" without ever explaining what these concepts represent. Meanwhile, in the paragraph encompassing lines 108 to 141 inclusive the authors go into a quite detailed discussion of the study by Reed (2005) but I am uncertain what this detailed discussion has to offer to the study. Other examples used are not particularly relevant to the study and I found this section a not well written literature review that requires significant effort to edit. Further, the authors need to link the discussion of these introductory sections to the purpose of the paper in	**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)* Brief explanation of "impact analysis" "partial valuation" and "total valuation" were given before ever mentioning the terms. Two different sources were quoted to back up these explanations. Discussion bordering on Reed (2005) was contained in lines 128 – 141 as against 108 – 141. However, lines 181 – 127 had been well edited.

	a clearer way. The materials and methods section is insufficient and does not provide the reader an adequate understanding of the methods and why these methods were used. For example (line 300) "…conducting personal and telephone interviews" of who and to what end and (lines 301 and 302) to what end were both descriptive and exploratory approaches used? What are relative importance index and principal component analysis and why were they selected for this research. At this point of the paper the reader does not understand what the question is that is being addressed or how the methods adopted are going to address the question. Finally, the Results and Discussion section of the paper is not well organized with only limited attempts to integrate the survey results to develop the insights. Each of the Tables is presented and followed by a limited discussion that provides little context from the overall question. Also the discussion accompanying Table 6 does not explain how RII is calculated and why it is important. The reader is provided little insight into what is being represented by any of the results, but in particular, Tables 7, 8 and 9 are not explained or expanded to aid understanding. Again, without a clear statement of the research question it is difficult for the reader to interpret the results in a meaningful way. Finally, the closing section of the paper makes	Materials and Methods section has been modified. The tables had been renumbered from 1 – 8. Former table 6 is now table 5. This has equally been modified.

	some strong recommendations on training without effectively linking the results presented earlier to these conclusions. Again, this section is poorly written and difficult to interpret.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	I thought that in general the paper is focused on an interesting problem. However, I did not feel that the paper did an adequate job of communicating the ideas or addressing the problem.	Thanks.