



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 (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	The article is poorly written. The manuscript presents a merely descriptive study. The reported findings do not contribute to an enhanced theoretical understanding of this issue. The methodology could be improved by estimating some models and showing the results instead of showing correlation which could not be significant. I assume the data are repeated cross section, rather than panel data. If they are repeated cross section the data may be pooled. But pooling makes an assumption that the coefficients are the same in the two periods (this assumption can be tested with a Chow test). It could be very interesting to see these results. If they are the same then only the intercept varies between the periods. Hence the author should look at the proportion of the change in the dependent variable can be explained by changes in the means of the explanatory variables (multiplied by their coefficients). The residual in this calculation is the autonomous component, which it appears will be substantial.	The reviewer does not explain which part of the paper is written poorly. Our manuscript contains essential elements of a scientific study. It provides theoretical and empirical evidences in support of research hypotheses. The purpose of applying DEA and not using other models is explained in the manuscript. Chow test is only applicable to the time series data. In this article we used cross-sectional data. Also here we apply the DEA to check efficient allocation of resources. Thus, we have not applied regression analysis. In the regression analysis we can find the changes in dependent variable by independent variable. Here the theme of the article is efficiency.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The real contribution over the previous research should be emphasized and clearly stated (including the abstract). The topic is interesting but the addressed question is not clear. I see two main problems with way this paper is	The real contribution over the previous studies is now emphasized (including abstract). Poverty is now defined more comprehensively and classified in context of objective poverty.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	presented. First, its motivation. The paper fails to convince the reader and to motivate the problem properly. For instance, some key concepts such as subjective poverty or people's perception about poverty are not considered. Results could be compared in clearer ways with previous finding. What is new in this paper should be emphasized, so that readers understand the real contribution easily. What do the new estimates tell us, compared with the known results from previous studies? More explanations on the data, why the author choose to use this dataset, why this set of countries are selected. Furthermore, reporting simple statistics of the data would be useful. These are the standard practices for empirical papers.	Subjective poverty is not considered in this paper. Results of this study are now compared with the findings of previous relevant studies. Selection of variables, sample size, data and its sources are explained now. A descriptive analysis of the data is now added in the paper.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		