



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	1. The author(s) aims to introduce a model, which can be used precisely and serve as a starting point both for the government and the institutions of higher education in determining actual and realizable costs. The literature review and description is scarcity in the paper. 2. This paper lacks a rigorous model specification and verification. 3. The structure of this paper is fragmental and arbitrary. Sometimes the statements are unclear and even hard to understand. For example, line 85 on page 3, the author states "Based on the finding of the project, it can be started that in Hungarian higher education there is a need (among other things) for such a post-calculation model that ...", but it is not	First of all, let me thank you for your insightful and valuable comments and suggestions. We have revised the paper in consideration of the issues indicated by the reviewer. The abstract has been rewritten, the literature review section has been revised and restructured. The methodological section has been revised, the model is presented in more detail and the different types of costs are also defined. The detailed introduction of the "Hungarian as a possible model", i.e. the discussion of the division of different cost types to the cost bearers was not the objective of the present paper. We have focused more on the results of application and their utilization. The overview of the financing models of international higher education has clearly shown that higher education is very heterogeneous in this respect also. Although the paper introduces a model developed in Hungary together with the results of its application, this can be useful for all institutions of higher education even if higher education is so heterogeneous. The management of all institutions of higher education should be fully aware of how



SDI Review Form 1.6

	clear why the author choose Hungarian for study. And the author might also want to provide some statistic information to examine the relationship between numerical analysis and model checking. 4. The author citing the characteristics of prime cost calculation in higher education from book, but lack in-depth empirical studies to examine the consequences. The author may want to provide a further explanation. Otherwise, the reader would have some difficulty in understanding their relations. 5. As a final note, this paper is just a brief review of the contents of the book, not academic articles.	the available resources are used and what the costs are. The structure of the paper has been modified in line with the suggestions. The methodological section has been revised, the model has been presented and the definitions of the various types of costs have also been added. The paper has been revised in line with the comments of reviewer.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The paper's writing format still is fragmental and arbitrary, the capital letters and lowercase letters are missed somewhere. 2. The format of the reference list still is not standard, author(s), book title, article title, publisher, date of publication, and page number(s), capital letters and lowercase letters are missed somewhere. The reference list need a rearrangement.	We have re-examined the article and attempted to correct all such issues and worked on eliminating fragmentary or arbitrary structures. We have consulted papers published in former issues of the journal as well as the style sheet available on the website and (re)arranged the reference list accordingly.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		