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

	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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**This manuscript deals with the factors influencing the choice of wetland valuation methods for the Estate Surveyor and Valuer. Despite the novelty of the case study is not highly relevant (the Questionnaire approach has been already widely used), the factors influencing seems to provide interesting findings. However, the framework of choice of wetland valuation method and questionnaire design is overly simplistic and vague. Therefore, I can not recommend the manuscript for publication before a major revision. There're the most important drawbacks I see:** **1. Questionnaire is overly simplistic to the 120 Estate Surveying and Valuation firms in Delta and Rivers States. (of course, why 120? What's the sampling proportion and error analysis? The claims seem confront with the difficulty of that the insufficient number leads to weakening of statistical characteristics. There is not sufficient explanation of the rationale for the research, as well as the discussion is completely missing.) The major problem seems that why the authors only limit the selection in the six factors of Fig.1. Did all the respondents know and agree with the division mode in authors' previous studies.** **2. There's no detailed explanation of the personal/telephone interviews.**	

	3. The discussion of the results is quite limited and also limited is the accuracy of methodological details presented in the Materials and Methods section; conclusions are consequently quite weak.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer