



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_10378
Title of the Manuscript:	RISK AND DEVELOPMENT IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES
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	My compulsory suggestion to consider in this article: 1. The paper contains little information about risk management. See abstract (verse 9-10). Author cites (except to Report WDR 2014) only one references on risk management (Cole, Gina and Vickery 2013). I think it is important to extend the information in this area. 2. There are not explicitly indicated and justification of the different periods of risk indicators use in statistical model. 3. Adjust the article to editorial requirements of the journal.	1. Author disagrees with this comment. Lack of risk management was referenced in Dercon and Christiaensen (2011) while its presence was cited in Karlan et al. (2012), Hoddinott, Rosegrant, and Torero (2012), and Hallegatte (2012). Given this literature, then, the use of risk indicators indirectly introduces the role of risk management in economic development. Nevertheless, author acknowledges this comment in the form of endnote 2 inserted in the last paragraph of the literature review section. 2. The different time periods for risk indicators is determined by the availability of the data. Again, thanks to the reviewer, we include this remark in new endnote 4. 3. Author will see to it that this is adhered to.
Minor REVISION comments	The research methods chosen for the study are discussed and justified in terms of the research problem. It is done properly, but quite generally. I recommend more detailed discussion of risk indicators selection.	Author feels that, in addition to the discussion of the selected risk indicators provided in the statistical model section, additional information on these is adequately given in the literature review section.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Subject of article is very interesting. Author points specify the interlinkage and synergy of selected risk indicators on economic development in developing countries. Discussed the issues are current and relevant. The study design is well reasonably and have practical significance. The proposed structure of the article provides a logical and consistent presentation of the problem. I recommend this for publication after only some minor revisions . The remarks are indicated to improve it. Considerations contained in it is a good basis for action by the author or other researchers more detailed research.	
---	---	--