



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_32828
Title of the Manuscript:	COST AND RETURNS ANALYSIS OF COIR PRODUCTS: A CASE Of EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
Type of the Article	Case study

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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	It would be more clearer if the input (independent) variables are stated in the abstract to match their corresponding impacts as stated in line 11 (1.12, 1.00, 1.11, 1.01 and 1.02). Sentences on lines 19-21, 21-22, and 22-24 need references to support those assertions and to make the work more credible and relevant. The objectives on line 78 should be part of the literature review with the specific objectives not numbered as in thesis. They should be normal sentences in the work without numbers. Year for the article in line 72 is required. The reference requires complete editing to follow IEEE format instead of APA citation style in the text with superscript The whole work needs proof reading for correcting the grammar.	As per Reviewer's comment modified whole article
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	On line 18 of the introduction section "coir" could replace "this" or be deleted. Also contextual meaning of "sine qua non" be put in bracket after it could help those that may not understand it. Sources for the sentence in lines 90-91 ("The total number of the coir fibre manufacturing units were 90 running in East Godavari district are 150 coir units") may help.	As per Reviewer's comment modified whole article



SDI Review Form 1.6

	There should be consistency in the referencing. Some part of the reference could not be upper case and others lower case as in Reference number 5. All should follow “capitalize each word” format or “sentence case” format. Also, initials should not appear in the reference citation in the text as in line 32 and similar ones if APA style is used. “(Coir Fibre, Rope, Yarn, Matting and Mats)” in the titles of Tables 1, 2, and 3 may not be needed. Majority of the references in the reference section have two sources and they should be separated for clarity. E.g., Vol. 23 Nos. 3&4, October-December 1988 and January- March 1989, pp. 87-94 should be corrected	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper contributes to knowledge to enhance growth in coir industry. Objectives of paper was achieved. The literature review was of average standard. The methodology and data analysis were consistent with study intent. Conclusion was linked to the findings of the analysis. The literature could be improved. Suggestion for future research will further broaden the literature of the researcher(s).	As per Reviewer’s comment modified whole article