



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_13149
Title of the Manuscript:	How Many Public and Private Schools We Need
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	Title: "How many public and private schools we need": unclear. Where? In the world? In OECD? In some particular country? Abstract: must present clearly objectives, methodology and main conclusions (results). These are not presented. Text: • Introduction: we can read on rationality-knowledge, market efficiency-knowledge, historical data on first formal schools and some descriptive data on conventional education system. <i>However, we can find nothing about the public and private schools that are supposed to be the main topic of this study.</i> • Many controversial and even wrong statements, see following examples: p.1, l. 31: "In the competition for survival, the people with more knowledge and physical power will survive" <i>May be valid for the stone age.</i> p.1, l.36: "A market may be perfect if all economic agents are at the same level of education" <i>A perfect market (that exist only in the models) needs much more variables. The same repeated in the conclusions (p.13, l. 671-672).</i> p.6, l.300: 4. Different function of private and public education. The formula is not well explained. Only tuition fees and family income are analysed. The result would be valid if in the economy exist only private schools. If there are high quality public schools, the results are not valid.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	p.6, l.318: “So public education plays a role of redistribution of social income, and the mount of public schools should increase when income gap increase, and decrease when income gap decreases.” <i>That is not correct. The government always must perform social policies to protect the poor population. What about the Scandinavian countries where the income gap is the lowest in the world, but the public education is the most developed.</i> p. 8, l. 381-383: “By contrast, at advanced stages of development free public education crowds out private education investment..., and stimulates fertility, and may impede growth”. <i>It is recognised in the scientific literature that the wide access to education (including girls) is decreasing fertility. And, the author of this paper is stating the positive influence of education on economic growth (p.4, l.188-298 the text presents how human capital can influence economic performance).</i> p.8, l. 432-434: “The price of public education is influenced by two factors, one is the quantity of managers who compete to manage public education???, and the other is the quantity of pupils who need public education”. p.8, l. 439-53: The Cobb-Douglas function would be valid only if $\alpha = \beta = 1$ and be constant in the time (which would imply unreasonably highly return of scale). p.11, l. 566-567 “Market competition is the force that furthers the development of education, an open, free and fair market is necessary platform that develops education” <i>Only partially true. What about public social policies?</i> • Parts 2.1 (education&entrepreneurship); 2.2 (education&incomes), and 3. (education&social development) <i>are very descriptive and general. Must be focused on pro</i>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<i>and cons of public and private education.</i> • p.11, 1.571-658 Part 6. Proportion of people in education. This text does not contribute at all to the objective of the paper. • Conclusions: very general, do not reflect the objectives of the paper; some parts refer to concepts that were not mentioned in the text. p.13, 1.683-684 "...Home education and community schools are recommendable" <i>concepts never mentioned in the paper.</i> • References: *Most of the texts are on education&entrepreneurship, education&earnings, and compulsory education. *From 76 references only three are directly related to public&private education: (56) James, E.; (58) Glom&Ravikumar, and (62) Azarnet LV. *Reference (53) Wang&Liu seems not to be related to the subject.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• The text must be edited by native English speaker. Many grammar errors and some spelling errors.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	• Objectives and methodology must be clearly presented in abstract and introduction • All parts must be relevant to the main objective. • The text needs more analysis and discussion, not only presenting data and quoting authors. • Conclusions must be based on data presented and statements made in the text. • More references on public private education should be included.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Antonina Ivanova Boncheva
Department, University & Country	APEC Study Center of the Autonomous University of Southern Baja California, Tijuana, México