



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_8942
Title of the Manuscript:	Social Accounting Matrix Balanced Based on Mathematical optimization Method and General Algebraic Modeling System
Type of the 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	The paper addresses the problem of balancing or estimating a SAM given disparate data sources and/or incomplete information. This is a problem that statistical agencies and researchers inevitably encounter when constructing a SAM database and is therefore addressing a policy relevant issue. Specifically, the author(s) compares the results obtained by balancing a SAM using 5 different methods that are implemented in GAMS. As such, the process of producing the results was, undoubtedly, time- consuming. The contribution of this paper is in extending the work of Robinson <i>et al</i> (2002) who assessed the performance of only two - the RAS and Cross entropy – methods to balance Mozambiqen SAM database. Whilst the paper is scientifically and technically robust, it needs to be revised substantially in order to ensure that it flows logically and for non-technical readers to appreciate its contribution. In particular, the author needs to discuss the testing procedure in section 4.2 in detail and move this material to under section 5, which should be re-titled as “Section 5 – Results” , and move material in sub-section 5.1 to sub-section 4.2 . Furthermore, the results presented in sub-section 5.2 should be discussed, explained and interpreted in detail. Currently, the authors has left it to the reader to do so. These will enable the reader to	(1) In Introduction Added “the contribution of this paper” (2) Examine that why the CE method is the best method (see section 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4) (3) We re-titled as “section 5.2.1 ~5.2.5”, in order to denoted the balanced SAM by five methods. (4) We have strengthened the conclusion. In this paper, we present a GAMS code and CE, LS, LP-L_1 and LP-L_∞ to balance an unbalanced SAM in ten steps. We obtained the five results (see section 5.2.1 to 5.2.5). We present a comparison of SSE values from matrices coefficient for each method. According to section 5.3 and section 5.4, we also explain that the CE method is the best method in five types the matrix balancing methods. (5) We have checked English grammar already.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	understand and appreciate this work. Currently, this sounds more like an appendix. The author has clearly under-sold his/her work to an extent that a casual reader will hardly appreciate this work. Finally, the conclusion needs to be substantially strengthened – what has been done in this paper and how and what is the policy implication of this paper. Why is the author recommending the use of cross entropy method? These are issues that the author can quickly address and without cost.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The author needs to seriously edit this paper. There are too many grammatical mistakes, incomplete sentences or phrases and spelling errors. These have greatly reduced the quality of what could otherwise have been a good paper. Editing it will be time –consuming. The author should consider asking someone to edit and proof-read the revised paper before sending it.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall, the paper is publishable subject to comments raised.	