

Review of: "Institutions and Socioeconomic Development: Do Legacies and Proximity Matter? Case Studies of Indonesia, the Philippines, and Thailand"

Patrick Yang

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The contribution to the study area of this paper becomes obvious when looking at the references presented and the paucity of timely and current research on the subject found and cited in the paper. Although an expert on the region might disagree, a fresh look at this topic is a welcome addition to the corpus of knowledge. I am honoured to offer my views on this document and a few suggestions to improve on a valuable submission.

The title chosen for the document tells the readers what to expect within. In addition, the purpose and objectives of the paper are stated by a clear research question:

What would happen if the change in social relations and motives that are requisite for the transformation of a subsistence society into a market economy do not occur or occur but at a pace that lags that of societal transformation?

Thus, the direction the paper intends to take is set and the readers' attention is primed to the issue discussed.

While noting the length of the study in its current form, I will deplore the absence of a separate section clearly labelled as a literature study. At a minimum, it might involve restricting the introduction to the first paragraph of the current introduction section and adding a section header labelled "literature review" afterwards. A more profound reorganisation of the text with some of the historical background found in the Results section in the Introduction would have my preference.

The research methodology is ambitious and the application of mixed method yields a document longer than many published. The narrative is instructive and denotes a deep understanding of regional and local questions. Often, casting too wide a net may yield a poor catch of fish and I would caution the authors here. I suggest some elements could be cut in the name of brevity, in particular in the section discussing results. Exposing detailed historical causes for the observed situation in the three countries may be detrimental to sustained readers' concentration. Although these explanations support the argument, they may be of limited interest to part of the readership.

The document states who the target population for interviews consisted of, i.e., *academics, public policy practitioners, and more* (p.3). The reader must consult tables 2, 3, and 4 to discover the sample was 39 or 13 observations for each of the 3 countries in the model. Although elsewhere in the document, N=24 is shown for the balanced panel. In the absence

of comment on how bias was controlled and number of interviews, generalisations on the sole quantitative portion of the study would be even more of a perilous exercise. I regretted how very little attention was given to a discussion of the national model and balanced panel results. In this mixed methods study, some rebalancing between the presentation of qualitative and quantitative results would be warranted. From a qualitative perspective, I would also have appreciated some explanation on the process used to extract relevant data from interview emails, e.g., codification, selection of balanced panel, etc.

The findings are not what I would have expected. Instead of interview results in section III(d), I found only an interpretation of the documentary evidence and nothing on interview results. If some of the insight is based on results from interviews, I did not see that mentioned. I suggest working on that aspect of the study given the labelling of that section.

Regarding conclusions and recommendations based on findings, a mention of what and how different and future researchers could add to this research is missing. Such a mention would signal to readers the authors project themselves beyond their own research and propose ways to expand on their work.

Provided interviews gave management insight, the inclusion of a discussion of policy implications of decisions taken by the three governments could be complemented by implications of a managerial or business nature.

A text can never get proofread enough. To find a typo in the very first paragraph of the text, as well as a missing period to close a sentence in the abstract, has a negative impact on a reader's willingness to accept the evidence presented.

a resurgence in democracy since 1998 buy <sic> is showing

Two more typos concerning a missing opening parenthesis and space after a comma on that same first page:

a certain task Dimmelmeier & Heussner,2018). <sic>

Aside from this general observation, the authors show a native command of English and I have no concern on the quality of the writing in that regard.

Unless mandated by Qeios, a font size of 12 or 10 points is more common in preprint than the 6.5 used throughout this text. Such a font size makes the text harder to read for anyone above 40 years of age and will translate into a lengthy article which may be harder to get published in many academic journals.

I noted some of the academic references are slightly dated, while the more recent references often refer to non-academic sources, e.g., web sites entries. This may reduce the appeal of a future submission based on this text to editorial boards of in-print academic journals.

Although the references to Web entries need work, I will focus on a different issue. The use of DOI references is not systematic and neither is the format shown. I would suggest reviewing all references and adding DOI whenever available

under the standard APA 7th edition format of:

Lipton, M. (1975). Urban bias and food policy in poor countries. Food Policy, 1(1), 41–52.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/0306-9192\(75\)90007-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0306-9192(75)90007-X)

Martin, T. N., & Hafer, J. C. (1995). The Multiplicative Interaction Effects of Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment on the Turnover Intentions of Full- and Part-Time Employees. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 46(3), 310–331. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1995.1023>

To conclude, your study was a worthwhile read and I wish you much satisfaction with its contribution to substantiated knowledge dissemination, with or without my subjective views.