



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	• In abstract general description is not required. So, first paragraph of the abstract can be removed. Write the abstract in one paragraph (100-150 words). It should contain the results of the analysis. • The title 1.1 (Line 15) is not required. Any authors should explicitly mention the objective of introduction in the context. • Title 3.1.1 is not a part of results/ discussions. It is only a part of methodology. This can be written as 2.2. • Title 3.1.2 (Calculation Scheme) is also not a part of results/ discussions. It is only a part of methodology. This can be written as 2.3. • I understand that 3.2 are also more suitable in methodology. • If it is possible to ass a cost calculation model (schematic diagram) will improve the clarity of the paper.	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 by removing the general description you mentioned and added a brief discussion of the results. The comment was accepted and acted upon in the revised submission. The comment was accepted and acted upon in the revised submission. The comment was accepted and acted upon in the revised submission. The comment was accepted and acted upon in the revised submission. The methodology section was further extended: besides the presentation of the cost calculation model, we have also defined the particular cost components of direct and indirect costs. However, in consideration of the heterogeneous system of higher education and the limitations on the length of the article, the detailed introduction of the



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• Conclusion not required any subtitle. Remove the title 4.1. Conclusion should stand for overall paper. • Rewrite the conclusion by specifying the output of the paper. • Some references are not used in the text.	“Hungarian” as a possible model was not a central objective in this article. We added a diagram also to address your request. The conclusion, results section was rewritten. We have extended the reference list while revising the article. At the same time, it should also be added that the study aims to synthesize 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. We indicated the missing references in the text.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• Try to add more references. • It is better to add a literature review part	We added more references by rewriting the abstract and the introductory section.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Lack of thorough knowledge about writing a journal paper is found throughout the paper. Try to understand the style of presenting the result.	Thank you for your comment, we have consulted published articles of the journal and attempted to use the same style in the submitted study.