



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 <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	The author did not bother to subject his/her paper for language editing. It seems to me like a hush-hush approach, which eventually infringe the integrity or the professionalism that the paper ought to hold dear. Eve, if you read the abstract, it is riddled with typo's errors like punctuation, the combining of words. These could have been avoided if the author paid proper attention to the paper. This level of carelessness of such an important topic for dissemination purposes is to be deplored. The editor must advise the author to subject the paper to professional language edited by a qualified person and is to furnish the editor of proof of such a move. Quality assessment or control is big must and it speaks to the issue of proper language editing. If we condoned the importance of language editing, then the thoughts or ideas encapsulated in the paper would not come to the fore as clear, correct and unambiguous. It is the author's responsibility to improve the English quality. Materials and method: the technical standards must be suitable and must also allow other researches to test the current author's hypothesis further. The data was not so well-controlled and robust. The author quickly introduce important principles cursorily without clearly explain their impact vis-à-vis the tenor of the research, like the introduction of the term hedging – out of the new. He/she should elaborate on the term, define it and locate its meaning in the paper and for what purpose.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Author mentioned respondents – it is a highly legal term referring to two opposition parties in a court setting. The word suddenly appears in line 159, without the author referring to who the respondent pertain to. This is a weak treatment of the material at his/her disposal. Coordinates have a double point of reference to a position on earth, which is usually cited as latitude (north-south) and longitude (east –west). Author refers to two coordinates and termed both as latitudes, which is wrong. Some of the sources denote to recent studies – it balanced with older sources. It is good. Statistical analyses are a must for this paper and the author succeeded in this endeavour. The conclusion supported the data discussed inside the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Publish paper contingent upon the direction that the author has to implement the suggestion(s) of the peer-reviewer.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Nico P Swartz</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Dept of Law, University of Botswana, Botswana</i>