



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_11708
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors influencing the conversion to organic farming in Gaza strip
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: 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	-The abstract is too long and too detailed. It should be brief and focused on methodology and brief results. -Literature review did not follow a standard review approach, the author has not critique the other authors, and the author does not tell us how the current study fits in to existing knowledge. -The referencing system used make it difficult for reviewers to cross-reference the citations. Section 3.3.2 Attitudes towards organic farming: -the use of likehart scale of -2 to 2 is strange given that the same variable was used for marginal interpretation in logit, I am not sure if this is correct, unless the authors borrowed this from an authoritative source	Thanks for your valuable comments - Abstract is shortened to less than 250 words. - Please check the added text to literature review in the modified article. The review of previous studies was mainly to justify the hypothesized determinants and applied methods. - Referencing system follows the journal instructions. - Using Likert scale of -2 to 2 was based on similar study De Cock L, 2005. For analyses purpose, the answers were rescaled from 1 to 5 and a high score reflects a positive attitude. This is stated in line 150-152-
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	the authors have not acknowledge the source of the empirical model used and the methodology followed	Please see the modified version line 170-172