



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_27838
Title of the Manuscript:	ECONOMIC EVALUATION OF SMALLHOLDER HONEY PRODUCTION TECHNOLOGIES IN SOUTHWESTERN NIGERIA
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	Please, extend the introduction with some word wide data on honey production (what is the share of Africa?) What the lector is missing: clear declaration of the aim of the paper and the hypothesis. The explanation of the results must be strengthened, giving the figures is not enough. (That is true for all tables, though the calculations, outcomes are good!) Economic viability analyses: should be extended with some comments on breakeven point, farm size. Chapter 3 is too short (real discussion is missing!) – must be extended.	
Minor REVISION comments	Suggested to find other keywords (not those from the title). Figures: better will be to show the lines on the spider plot diagrams. Wider international literature background on the world's honey production and some references of methodology will strengthen the value of the paper.	
Optional/General comments	The paper is a relatively good one, taking into consideration the number of the case studies, the period of the evaluation. The quality of the paper must be increased by clarifying the aims, methods, by real discussion of the got results	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hab. Takács-György Katalin
Department, University & Country	Óbuda University, Hungary