



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. Was this manuscript written in the right format and with the right terms? e.g. "pro-/anti-poor" in line 319? 2. In "Problem Statement" (line 52), there was no problem stated but "different factors effecting poverty". 3. The hypothesis concerned about "income growth" (line 70) but not "income equality" (line 18, line 285) which confused. 4. The conclusion was so strong (line194) that what makes this result of "education" different from Janjua and Kamal (2011)? 5. There was correlation coefficient in Table 1 (line 357) but no significance listed. It was hard for authors to conclude "strongest correlation" solely with coefficient. The comparison between education and health efficiency in Table 2 and 3 (line 422 and 435) was rely on correlation coefficient and not clear enough.	1. Yes, the terms pro-poor and anti-poor are used correctly (see footnote 2) 2. In introduction statement of research problem is improved. 3. Income inequality as relative poverty is a part of poverty imbedded in the hypothesis. 4. Our study is different from Janjua and Kamal (2011) because it elaborates the concept of externalities of education for income growth and poverty alleviation. 5. The level of significance of correlation coefficients is now added in the paper.
Minor REVISION comments	1. Where was the data coming from? Were they robust and confident when the authors mentioned "do not provide exact information" (line 319)? 2. The hypothesis was about "education and health" situation of the country while the research based on the expenditures of education and health. 3. Figure 2 (line 233) was adapted from Figure 1 but there was no evidence or support for this framework.	1. Data sources are added in the paper. There is no problem of robustness of data. The relevant text is rephrased for better understanding. 2. Spending on education and health significantly improve education and health outcome that reduce poverty. Thus, the research appropriately addresses the hypothesis that "improvements in education and health reduce poverty". 3. Figure 2 is adapted from figure 1 on the basis of theoretical arguments and empirical evidences as mentioned in the text.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Citations and references should be enlisted more clearly. The results of this manuscript were not strong enough to support ideas and hypothesis of the authors.	Citations and references are improved. Our analysis provides evidence in favour of our four hypotheses.
--	--	--