



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	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	The main conclusions of the study, which are not much new, are based on very simple measures –the simple coefficients of correlation. It is necessary to probe the relationship between poverty and education, health etc., with better statistical methods. Efficiency is also measured in education, health and poverty -- in a crude fashion. There is not much discussion on measuring efficiency. The problem statement is very poorly written. "Plausible poverty determinants" are not analysed, as claimed/proposed by the author. Only economic growth and secondary education and life expectancy are considered. The paper reads well; the author is aware of some relevant research, though there is a lot that he/she can refer to. Methodologically it seems to be a poor study.	Descriptive analysis is added to elaborate the relationship between public spending on education and health, human capital and poverty. The reason for opting DEA (instead of modelling with regression analysis) is explained in the paper. The concept of efficiency in context of Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) is further explained. Problem statement is improved and relevant definitions of poverty are added in the introduction. The basic purpose of the paper is not to analyse all possible determinants of poverty but to focus on one of the most important determinants of poverty, namely public spending for education and health. Literature review and methodological parts are enriched.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The approach of the author is good, but I doubt whether the methodology adopted to arrive at the conclusions reached is adequate.	