

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

Justice Djokoto

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In a study titled Institutions and Socioeconomic Development: Do Legacies and Proximity Matter? Case Studies of Indonesia, the Philippines, and Thailand, the authors presented some interesting thoughts. Based on a mixed methods approach, some recommendations based on the findings of the study were presented.

The topic is interesting and the countries used in the superlative analysis are both similar and different in some respects. The authors can improve the introduction by describing the problem under investigation better than it has been done now.

The authors presented the literature in the introduction section. However, the underlying theory that informed the study is not apparent from the paper. The authors should consider providing that.

The use of mixed methods in the study is a plus. This takes account of the advantages of both qualitative and quantitative approaches. However, the definition, and sources of the data are not clearly outlined. The regression model estimated must be stated in the introduction section. As the data is a panel, the appropriate tests must be performed; Hausman test for specification, heteroscedasticity, serial correlation etc.

I am unsure if the  $N=3$ ,  $T=8$  giving 24 observations is adequate for the estimation. I suppose the limited sample informed the estimation of models mostly with one explanatory variables.

The use of simple regression is problematic because some variables other than the key variables influence the stated explained variables. Failure to account for these introduces an error, omitted variables error. This error calls into question the results of the coefficients. The authors must consider including control variables in the regression model(s). These would require search for additional data as the efficiency of the estimates will be impaired.

The presentation of the results appears rudimentary. The presentation of the 'raw' results is unsatisfactory. I recommend the authors read other economic papers and improve the presentation of their results.

Finally, some minor comments. I recommend the authors undertake a more thorough spelling edit. Also, there appears to be many long sentences. This made the reading difficult. On many occasions a long track and had to read some sentences three times. I recommend the authors use short sentences.

Following from the above, the manuscript submitted requires a substantial review to be acceptable to the academic community.