



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_20305
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Namibian fishing product export prospects and diversification: Gravity Model Approach
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	1. However, in Tables 5 and 6 the significant values might be highlighted for easier interpretation. 2. As the key methodology of the paper is the Gravity Model, the author should indicate the long history of the concept by mentioning some of the classics of the topic around lines 114-118 as references: e.g. <i>Reilly, W.J. (1931): The Law of Retail Gravitation. New York: The Knickerbocker Press</i> or <i>Nijkamp, P. (1975): Reflections on Gravity and Entropy Models. Regional Science and Urban Economics, Vol. 5, pp. 203</i> 3. Some of the mathematical formulas and equations are not very clearly written, sub-indices and Greek letters are not clear (see minor revision comments).	1. As suggested bolded on the tables 2. The other reviewer requested to shorten the Gravity model background as a result I found not important to talk about history just to keep the size of paper short 3. Since the section shorted most of the formulas removed; the existing updated as suggested
Minor REVISION comments	line 31: <u>operation at full capacity</u> should be <u>operates at full capacity</u> line 34: <u>3.6%, while</u> should be <u>3.6% of the country's GDP</u> line 55-56: In Figure 1 <i>a scale should be added to the vertical axis</i>. Also a <i>secondary vertical axis</i> should be better for the fish production series, as their values are too small to be clearly visible on the left axis. line 139: <i>Equation 1</i> is not every clear in its present form, as the author does not apply subscripts/sub-indices for the letters "i" and "n", and also the Greek letter "phi" is not recognisable. Also there is a mistake in the equation, instead of M_i the correct version is M_n. Either the original version of the equation should be used: $X_{ni} = G S_i M_n \Phi_{ni}$ or if the text editor does not support these special	All the comments are addressed carefully, the mathematical formulas are removed due to the other reviewer comment



SDI Review Form 1.6

	characters the equation should be written in a slightly modified version, e.g.: $X(n,i) = G S(i) M(n) F(n,i)$ Please correct the explanations accordingly, in lines 140-142, and 153 too. line 157-161: Equation 2 and Equation 3 should be improved the same way as Equation 1. similarly. In line 158 there is a mistake in the explanation of notations: "Where $Y_i = \sum_n X_{ni}$ is the value of production, $X_i = \sum_n X_{ni}$ is the value of the importer's.." should correctly be "Where $Y_i = \sum_n X_{ni}$ is the value of production, $X_n = \sum_i X_{ni}$ is the value of the importer's.." line 165: <u>a # b # 1</u> should be <u>a ≠ b ≠ 1 tes at full capacity</u> line 166: Tinbergen (1962) should be included in the References. lines 177-179: The sentence "<u>...if there are no variables omission variables, in case if there are, but the model is best to use.</u>" is fuzzy, please try to give a clearer explanation. (Maybe: "<u>...if there are no omitted variables, or if there are some, but the model is best to use.</u>") lines 192-193 should be deleted, as the formulas are not very meaningful without more precise explanation. Instead, the end of the sentence in line 191 should be changed a little, giving a text explanation of the null hypothesis instead of the formulas. line 203 : Prentice et al. (1998) should be added to References. line 209: Please explain the exact meaning of the indices "i", "j" and "t" as used in equations 4 and 5. line 323-324: The sentence is not clear, please correct it. line 398: The paper Riley and Eton (2006) is not referred in the text, therefore it should be deleted from the References, too.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author nicely explains the rationale of the paper, and the objectives of the research. The introduction gives a detailed and clear picture of the fishing industry in Namibia. The language and style of the paper is clear, the illustrations – tables and figures –are nice and informative, only a few minor improvements are suggested (see minor revision comments). The statistical analysis is correct, the presentation of the results is clear. The interpretation of the statistical analysis is given in Conclusions and the author gives a good explanation of the findings, adding recommendations and suggestions for policy.	
---	--	--