



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	First of all, the article was presented by Daly, Ph.D. and H. Nsiah at the 26th Conference of the Nordic Sociological Association in 2012 and is <u>already available online</u> at: http://www.google.ca/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CCwQFjAA&url=https%3A%2F%2Fnotendur.hi.is%2Fshj%2FPapers%2FTrust.and.Social.capital%2FDalyandNsiah.TrustandSocialCapitalII.2012.docx&ei=4ujEUeTnGNDzsga0qoGQDA&usg=AFQjCNFVVMsLRhOKEkTPjwZiD0n7EwUgfg&bvm=bv.48293060,d.Yms Accordingly, I am assuming that Daly and Nsiah are the ones who submitted the paper. Obviously, <u>this is strong grounds for rejecting the article as it has already been published.</u> Nevertheless, below are my comments on the article anyway. In general, the paper is poorly-written and the flow of ideas is not smooth. It is rather confusing to the reader. A case in point is the abstract which cannot be understood clearly before one reads the article a number of times. As such, it needs major editing. Lines 33-34 and the abstract argue that the research attempts to ascertain if trust can be affected by increased awareness of business practices. But the sentence in lines 23 – 25 is not consistent with the aim presented earlier. The statement says that the first survey is done as “a step towards	



SDI Review Form 1.6

increasing potential investor knowledge of the market”. Further Line 84 states that “the focus of the current study is to increase familiarity of potential investors with Bulgarian business behavior”. Is this the aim or is it to examine the impact of the knowledge of the business environment on potential investor trust? The aim of the article and dependent variable has to be identified clearly.

Lines 27 – 28 refer to “wealth of research supporting the understanding that trust is a crucial element etc” but quotes only 2 books written back in the 1990s and only one academic paper written in 2006. The article needs to quote recent academic articles and research on this subject.

Line 39 begins saying “the survey used in this research attempts to “”, then line 41 says “the second survey of this study was conducted” And then line 49 says “A second survey recorded the ...”. Readers need not be guessing. Please clarify.

Line 47 states that “there is some ability to generalize results to other transitional economies ...”, while the conclusion (lines 360-361) says otherwise. It reads as follows “it cannot be assumed that the findings for a Bulgarian study would correlate or transfer to other former-communist countries or people”.

Experimental detail section

This section presents literature review of the importance of trust and ethics in business and not the impact of familiarity on trust and willingness to partnership (the dependent variable in the submitted article)



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Methodology section Line 152 states “and small business owners with no experience in Bulgaria”. The article needs to clarify immediately that this group is small business owners in the U.S. Midwest and not wait and explain later! It is a bit difficult to understand the assumption of the paper that a main segment of the pool surveyed, that is expatriates working in Bulgaria, do not understand the business environment in the country and that a simple survey of few Bulgarian small business people will help those expatriates understand this environment. The methodology suffers from serious drawbacks which have been acknowledged by the paper itself in the conclusion. This draws serious doubt on its usefulness. Results and discussion section The discussion is not clear and it is useful to attach copies of the sample surveys. Conclusion section Very weak conclusion with no policy recommendations. It contains large paragraphs that do not belong to a conclusion (lines 299 -314 and Lines 321 – 341). The paper does not add valuable contribution to this subject.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer