



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_6461
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role of Education and Health in Poverty Alleviation A Cross Country Analysis
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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 The paper presents an analysis of the effects of education expenditure and health expenditure in the reduction in poverty, income inequality, increase in enrollments and life expectancy for 40 countries in the period 1997-2007. DEA is the method employed in the study. It arrived at interesting results. However, in order to be published the author should revise the question below.	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	It should explain the reasons for choosing the definition of pro-poor and anti-poor growth employed in the paper. The box-plot shows the presence of outliers. What are the effects of removing the outliers in the results? The analysis of the results are short, there are 8 figures with few comments on them. The results should be better explored. Is it really necessary to employ DEA to arrive at the conclusions? What are the relationships between the results of the DEA and the pro-poor and anti-poor growth?	Reasons for choosing the definitions of pro-poor and anti-poor growth are elaborated. The box-plot does not show the existence of outliers (see Appendix 4) Exploration of results through various figures is improved. The scope and limitation of the application of DEA is explained. The results of DEA and pro-/anti-poor growth are interpreted with additional Appendix 5
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	What is DMUs (line 290)? The quality of the figures 5 to 10 should be improved. It is difficult to read the name of the countries. Sub-sections 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 should be rewritten and they should be part of the introduction. The names Problem Statement, Objectives and Hypotheses, and Significance of the Study should be removed of the paper. Section 2 should start with the concept of poverty. The name Literature Review should be removed of the paper.	DMUs are Decision Making Units. The abbreviation is explained in the text. The quality of figures 5 to 10 is improved. Sub-section titles, namely Problem Statement, Objectives and Hypotheses, and Significance of the Study are removed. Similarly, 'Literature Review' is removed as title of Section 2 and the section is renamed with 'Concept of Poverty' as suggested by the reviewer.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		