



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 <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	1. The relevance of trust for business relations needs much more theoretical clarification (see for instance Akkermans et al, 1999) 2. The description of the situation after the reforms in Bulgaria needs to be improved. This description is poor (for health care reforms in Bulgaria this has been done by Atanasova et al. in 2011 in Health Policy and by Rechel et al. in 2011 in BMC Health Services Research). 3. The design of the study with Likert scores etc. needs to be clarified in a separate Methods section and not in the Section Results and Discussion 4. The comparison of the scores should be illustrated with tables. 5. This comparison is only useful when the author(s) use(s) statistical tests to discover whether differences are significant and relevant. The reader cannot determine now if differences are significant and relevant. This is a very serious problem that needs to be addressed. 6. The author(s) did not ascertain whether differences in the Likert scores between the surveyed groups might be attributed to other differences (age, gender, education level etc.) between the groups. This is a very serious problem that needs to be addressed. 7. The English needs to be improved.	1. See line 150. 2. The authors feel that digressing into the reforms in Bulgaria are completely outside the scope of this paper. Especially healthcare reform which is a government controlled area of service. This paper focuses on non-government area of business and private ownership. Additionally, reforms are not necessarily pertinent to perceptions of trust, bribery, etc and these items are the focus of the paper under review. The knowledge of these reforms could potentially be another area to survey respondents on but again, this is outside the scope of the current work which sought to find <i>perceptions</i> affecting investment. The authors could also benefit from a line reference from the reviewer and will continue to investigate the references offered in order to expand their research and future work into the area. This may be a very viable lead into another research paper...so thank you for these ideas! 3. The authors have included the survey as an appendix and added line 183 in the text as further clarification. 4. Addressed in Reviewer comments 1. 5. This is meant to be an exploratory survey. This is a valid comment that the authors hope to address via additional surveys and tests in future work.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		6. This issue is a valid concern and is addressed in line 166 and 192. 7. If the reviewer could give us specific lines and ideas for improvement we would be very appreciative of the feedback. The authors are unsure of where to make specific changes at this time.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		