



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_5162
Title of the Manuscript:	Does Familiarity Increase Trust for Potential Investors? Implications for Central and Eastern Europe
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	The research paper is named <i>Does Familiarity increase Trust for Potential Investors? Implication for Central and Eastern Europe</i>, and propose to find the level of trust taking into consideration the working environment for small businesses. Still, the corpus of the paper reveal an analyses for the Bulgarian business environment and, even if the Bulgaria is a country from the eastern Europe, it not be concluded that the results obtained are the same for the Central and Eastern Europe countries (even the author/s noted that: line 360, 361 <i>it cannot be assumed that the findings for a Bulgarian study would correlate or transfer to other former-communist countries or people</i>). To potency the value of the study made for the Bulgarian business environment to establish if the investors have trust to develop new businesses in this country, I recommend to the author/s to change the title in order to be more focused on the issue.	Authors agree and title has been amended.
Minor REVISION comments	Some suggestions to increase the value of the work: - The author/s makes a literature review in accordance with the topic and which explain the terms <i>trust and familiarity</i>, but the author/s no mention which is the personal opinion and interpretation of the terms choose for this study. - The methodology is based on Likert's scale and is conducted to reveal the behaviour of potential investors when the business place is in Bulgaria,	a. References are made, for example line 131 and 136. Given that this is an exploratory study and very little published literature references this particular country, the authors sought to present their own elements of trust as built upon by these accumulation of previous knowledge offered in research. This is seen in the sections of the survey. The survey is being forwarded to the publishers and can be included as an appendix if



SDI Review Form 1.6

	also, the behaviour of the Bulgarian owners of small businesses. Maybe the author/s can be more specific with the surveyed sample (at the lines 157, 158, the authors said <i>an equal number of surveys were given to expatriates living in Sofia, Bulgaria and small business owners in the Mid-western United States???</i>, than at the line 165 said a second survey was conducted with Bulgarian small business owners). It is a little confused.. c. I suggest that the data used to calculate the rates to be included in some tables (are easier to read and to make the connection between them). d. The conclusions reflect my comments about the title of the paper. The author/s expresses the results of the study for the Bulgarian business environments, making, indeed, some reflection about the ethical issues at the European level but only from the literature and not as a expression of the results of the study. e. The author/s must complete the references (some of them are written incomplete).	acceptable by the editors. Its inclusion may help to clarify this point and © below. Additionally, references are made in lines: 63, 85, 91, 106, and 113. b. The authors are not sure how to make this more clear. There were two surveys and the first went to expats in Bulgaria and to small business owners in the USA/Midwest. The second survey went to Bulgarians who owned small businesses. c. The authors felt that the use of tables did not enhance the display of the information and also caused the paper to become too long. If this is an important element authors would seek to receive permission to include the averages of answers via an appendix. d. Agreed, and the title and other references have been changed. e. Could the reviewer be more specific? All references are complete to our information available.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The idea of the research paper is very good, because the ethical issues became more and more defining for the successful or unsuccessful of businesses, especially for the countries with no experience or good practices in business (the former communist countries which had to learn the principles of a free market economy). To develop businesses and to find some mechanisms to attract the investors and to maintain them in the country, the ethical values as trust, honour, compliance, acquaintance, fair play etc. are crucial. So, this paper gives some responses about the boundaries and barriers of Bulgarian business environment and about the practices and beliefs in trust and willingness as values.	
---	--	--