



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_20015
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of industrial paddy processing on local rice competitiveness in Benin
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	In Materials and Methods section, the selection of rice processing factory which produced SONAPRA price was not sufficiently explained. The author only referred to 26 women paddy processors-and-traders, but it was not clear whether this (26) already included one sample of processing factory. Note that in line 208, the 26 respondents are called indigenous paddy processors, but throughout results and discussion section, indigenous processors (25) are separated from industrial processing factory (1), and indigenous rice is separated from factory processed rice. It seems that samples consisted of 25 indigenous paddy processors and one industrial processing factory, and the author needs to confirm whether or not this assumption is true.	Right. Enough clarification is now provided on the sample structure. Indeed, the samples consisted of 25 indigenous paddy processors and one industrial processing factory (represented by the factory manager).
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Student T test in line 367 is not included in data analysis sub-section. If this is part of data analysis it should be indicated in Materials and Methods section. In Table 3, correct the use of comma rather than period in some numbers for SONAPRA rice. Line 411-413: conclusion is based only on quality index. It should be based on the three indicators mentioned: quality index, market gate cost price, and quality index/price ratio.	Ok. Correction is done. Ok. Corrected. Ok. Corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Are there any previous studies using the three indicators mentioned in this paper to measure rice competitiveness? If yes, please include them. One of the main factors causing the low rice competitiveness is the higher price of local paddy compared to imported rice. Despite not being the scope of this paper, it would be useful to link the present study with the previous studies that address rice production competitiveness in Benin or Africa using, for example, Policy Analysis Matrix (PAM) method. This can be included in the review of literature.	Done. Literature review is upgraded accordingly. Ok, considered as above.