SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BJEMT_32662**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Fair trade minimum price: a comparative Arabica coffee market analysis**
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. I appreciated author's / authors' efforts to investigate a very interesting subject which, in my opinion, will definitely incite the readers' attention. The paper was an agreeable reading and offered a consistent presentation of the analysed topic. The authors explore a complex issue, not very much assessed in the literature from the empirical point of view with concrete case studies. This is the main reason why I consider the article worth publishing. Its empirical study is based mainly on visual basic analyses of the price trends and the quality and level of the paper would highly benefit if more statistical and econometrical analyses of the price series were performed and provided in order to support the conclusions and to offer even more insight in the matter (however, I do not necessary consider this improvement to be mandatory for publication). 2. The manuscript has a few grammatical and syntax errors which can be corrected easily. Some of the suggestions I offer are provided at the Minor **REVISION comments.** However the list is not exhaustive, consequently a proofreading and editing is required. 3. The initial part in the article's structure should be revised and reorganized. The section entitled INTRODUCTION takes about 30% of the article, while it includes elements that would better be placed in a section entitled LITERATURE REVIEW or a section entitled STATE OF THE ART. Consider making two	

	(even three) distinct sections from the first 5 pages of the paper. Keep Introduction at approximately 1.5 – maximum 2 pages long where to specify more clearly the topicality of the subject, the motivation, the purpose of the paper and the research questions. At the end of the Introduction, add a paragraph where to present the structure of the paper as it follows from that point forward. In this way, the paper will be introduced much strongly and it will manage to better captivate readers' attention. 4. In section 3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS, subsection 3.1., consider offering a more detailed and clarifying discussion after Figure 2. The current text does not offer much interpretation of the graphs. Also, for Figure 3, please introduce in the legend the explanation for the 3rd variable. In subsection 3.4, please provide Source for Figure 7, even if it is "authors' elaboration". For Figure 7 and Figure 8, the choice of representation of the variables would be better if it was the same (same type of line for the same variable – see NYCE and local) in order to provide a better basis for comparison between the two figures. 5. The CONCLUSION section is well written. It may also be entitled CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS or CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS as it also provides some ideas in this direction. All in all, an interesting study, with a very good topic.	

Minor REVISION comments	1. In the ABSTRACT, at section Aims, at the end of the second line, consider replacing the word “much” with a more adequate substitute (e.g. ‘the majority of’ or ‘the most part of’ etc.) 2. In the ABSTRACT, at section **Methodology and Duration of Study, “…**the FTM price and the local price for the same period” – please specify exactly the period (two different periods above and it creates confusion). 3. Other suggestions for minor corrections are provided as follows: Line 18: …choices in *the* recent years… Line 58: “two main major global organizations” – keep just one word: main or major From Line 51-69 there are no references for the stated information – some sources should be specified. Line 119: “(farmer relations/consumer…) correct using “farmer / consumer relations”. Line 121: the interest of *the* society. In many places in text it is used “in the other hand” – replace with “on the other hand” (e.g. Line 134, Line 195, Line 318) Lines 148-149: “Coffee is one of the most sold products in the international market; it shares with the petrol the position of higher commodity traded on world stock exchange.” – consider rewriting the phrase as it is a bit ambiguous.	

	Line 185: The *coffee production cost* is elaborate**d** in Brazil.. Line 202: consider replacing “coffees” with “coffee types” Line 244: …all these analys**e**s… Line 266:…these figures were… Line 296: replace “ratios” with “rates” Line 305-306: “This meant a 32,92% depreciation of the currency.” – please specify the reference moment (is it April 2011?) Line 306-308: The text says “The Brazilian currency was one of that most devalued one among the countries called the "five fragile" countries (Turkey, South Africa, Russia, India, Indonesia and Brazil) that were more vulnerable to increasing interest rates in the United States economy” – consider revising and rewriting the text to be clearer, also analyzing the choice of the word “devalued” versus “depreciated”. Line 376: Replace first word “If” with “For”.	
Optional/General comments	If the author/authors agree, in my opinion maybe a minor change in the paper’s title would make it clearer. I suggest the following: ‘Fair trade minimum price: a comparative analysis for the Arabica coffee’	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Larisa Nicoleta Pop***
Department, University & Country	***Department of Economics, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania***