SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_BJEMT_10744**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ANALYSIS OF THE DETERMINANTS OF FRESH FISH MARKETING AND PROFITABILITY AMONG FISH TRADERS IN SOUTH -SOUTH NIGERIA: THE CASE OF AKWA IBOM STATE**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	-How was the data collected? the sampling technique(s)-indicate this at the abstract. -Recommending interest free loans is never an economic argument. Maybe access to affordable credit could be more appropriate. -How was this selection of areas done? Was it random? -The author(s) have not given the merits of selecting the approach and methods of data analysis and their demerits. Could there be possible demerits of other methods, not selected? -The author(s) did not attempt explain how the research questions/hypothesis are answered/tested from the empirical models. -Regression analysis: Is this the author(s) formulation? where was the model borrowed from? How did he/she select the variables included in the analysis? Have other authors used similar number of variables? -Which theoretical model guided the analysis? -Results are poorly presented. The reader goes through the narrative before meeting with the tables. -The justification for selecting a functional for is wrong! You do not select a functional form on the basis of the number of significant variables or the size of R. -The author(s) should also be able to justify the functional form chosen for the model even if they've assumed a simple linear relationship between variables. -Test the assumptions of the classical linear regression model (CLRM) and make changes to the model as	

	necessary. -Finally, spend some time examining the sensitivity of your results by making slight modifications to the variables (sometimes influenced by the outcomes of CLRM tests) included in the model and the functional form of the relationship. -If your results are stable to these types of variations, that provides additional justification for your conclusions -Proper referencing should be followed. One cannot distinguish between the Book, journey articles and other articles	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer