



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_20287
Title of the Manuscript:	Specifying the Costs of Academic Training in Higher Education
Type of the 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	The abstract reads like a classroom introductory text. The grammar is too rambling and difficult to follow and will need to be totally reworked. The introduction does not provide the relevant background information nor justification for the work. Not a single reference is cited and yet the subject matter is not novel. Some attempt should be made at reviewing this subject, so that the gap the research is trying to fill will be clearer. The methodology does not present any methods for the research work. If a clear objective for the work is postulated then a appropriate method for attaining the objectives will be presented. The work lacks depth and the presentation is very poor. It is more like a classroom note and is unacceptable since the manuscript is scientifically inept and technically	First of all, let me thank you for your valuable comments and suggestions. We have completed major revisions on the article based on your feedback. We have rewritten the abstract, made the necessary changes in terms of grammar and worked on creating a text that is easier to follow. The introduction was revised in line with the comments. The submitted article discusses the framework and findings of a pilot project conducted in Hungary while the model and the underlying methodology (which has to consider the specific characteristics not only for each country but also for each institution separately) can be applied more widely and its results can prove to be useful for all institutions of higher education. Please allow me to note that the development of the model and the methodology is the result of a project lasting for more than 4 years. The detailed introduction of methodology was not the main objective of this article we focused mainly on the presentation of the model and the application of its findings. Still, we revised the methodology section in the revised version of the study. The section on methodology was extended and the manuscript style was also revised to reflect academic considerations more.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	unsound. The reference is poor and unacceptable.	We have extended the reference list while revising the article. At the same time, it should also be added that the study aims to introduce the findings of our own research and the literature review section (where more references could have been included) was shortened due to limitations in the length of the paper.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		