



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_33258
Title of the Manuscript:	RISK AND RISK MANAGEMENT PRACTICES: A CASE OF RICE MILLERS IN CROSS RIVER STATE
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Please, find below points that could improve the paper. (1) Include a literature background about sources of risk and risk management practices. (2) Identify the gap and/or contribution of the study to the body of knowledge. What previous research about the topic did and did not do to justify this study? (3) Provide author citation for the quote on lines 74 to 76. (4) Methodology section: Possible confusion about study population and sampling frame. If all rice millers in Cross River State included the three agricultural zones, and the author worked only with two of them, the sample frame is different from the population. On the other side, if the population included only millers from two agriculture zones, it should be better explained. Moreover, "the level of rice production in the State" means that these two LGA's comprise the production majority? Please, be clear. (5) Methodology section: Describe questions of the questionnaire, or variables of the study. (6) Results and discussion section: the author listed eleven risk sources, however, what was the source of these risk sources? Did the author use previous risk sources found in the literature? Or did the author ask the millers (open questionnaire) what were the perceived risk sources? The author should add these in the methodology. (7) Results and discussion section (Table 1): There is a possible confusion about risk and risk sources. Some of the items in the list are not "sources of risk", but risks. Sources of risk are broad areas. Please, check and clarify. (8) Results and discussion section: The author ranked five risk management practices, however, what was the source of these practices? Did the author use previous practices found in the literature? Or did the author ask the millers (open questionnaire) what were the practices? How many practices were identified? The author should add the source, at least, and the list of the practices to the methodology section, and add how many practices were evaluated in the results section.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(9) Results and discussion section: The author stated that "Increased wage rate and high land rental were also found to be the main factors that push up production cost for the farmers.". Please, cite the source of this finding. (10) Results and discussion section (lines 209-210): How did the author reach the conclusion about the correlation between payoff and risk taken? What is the support in the results to reach this conclusion? (11) Provide limitations of the study and future research.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	(1) The objective sentence in the Abstract (...the study analysed (...) by rice millers.) should be better organized. (2) Define the term LGA in the Abstract. (3) Provide the numerical range capacity associated with each linguistic value (small, medium, big, and large) to characterize the mill. A "medium" size in Nigeria can be a "small" size on another place. (4) Methodology section (lines 127 to 131): There's no need to repeat the explanation of Kendall W's statistics. (5) Methodology section: specify the 4-point rating scale used. (6) Results and discussion section (line 200): Please, check the values and how to report the values for r and P value. (7) Results and discussion section (table 4): Table could be better understood if the author includes a legend of the coefficients (e.g. B, S.E.) (8) Conclusion section (line 252): Please, check the sentence "The risk of theft, ill-health, war and government regulations.". It seems to be not connected to any other sentence. (9) References: Please, check SDI template to adjust references.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	(1) The author provided a good background about rice in Nigeria, including its supply chain and mills. (2) Please, check different font styles on the Abstract. (3) Results and discussion may be better organized in two different sections. Sometimes, it is confused to understand if the author is talking about the study's findings or findings from past studies.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Claudia Garrido Martins</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Civil Engineering, University of New Mexico, USA</i>