Review of: "Attitude towards business activity risk: evidence using logit models for two groups of OECD countries"

Neema P. Kumburu

General Performance

The report is well-crafted, offering valuable insights into attitudes towards business activity risk. The evidence presented utilizes logit models, focusing on two distinct groups of OECD countries. Not only is the study meticulously conducted, but it is also particularly timely and relevant. However, there are areas that require improvement as follows

Introduction

The problem statement requires further fortification through explicit justifications for the existence of the problem. It is imperative to delineate precisely why the identified issue is a matter of concern and elucidate the ongoing debates in the field. Mere presentation of previous studies, while informative, falls short without an examination of their outcomes. Understanding the results of these studies is crucial as it provides a context for establishing the research gap that this study aims to address**.**

Objectives of this study

The section that requires improvement is the basis for formulating hypotheses. Typically, hypotheses are derived from empirical literature or established theories. Unfortunately, in this study, there seems to be a lack of a solid foundation for the hypotheses. It is essential to explicitly connect the hypotheses to existing empirical evidence or theoretical frameworks to enhance the credibility and coherence of the study. This will ensure that the hypotheses are grounded in a well-established context and contribute meaningfully to the research objectives**.**

Methods

While the methodology is commendable for its reliability, enabling the repeatability of a similar study, there is a notable omission in terms of the research design. It is crucial to specify whether the study adopts a cross-sectional, case study, or longitudinal design to provide a clearer understanding of the research framework.

Additionally, the candidate is encouraged to articulate the rationale behind choosing the non-linear logit model over alternative models. Providing justification for this decision is pivotal in demonstrating the methodological rigor of the study. To enhance the clarity of the methodology section, the candidate should address three key questions: What method is employed? How is the method applied? And why was this particular method chosen? By answering these questions, the

methodology section will become more focused, realistic, and conducive to a comprehensive understanding of the research approach.

Results

The presentation of results requires a more scientific approach, encompassing all relevant information such as P-values and coefficients. To enhance the rigor and transparency of the findings, it is imperative to include comprehensive details that contribute to the statistical significance and interpretation of the results. Providing P-values and coefficients not only strengthens the scientific validity of the study but also offers a more complete understanding of the relationships and patterns identified. This inclusion will enable readers to assess the robustness of the results and draw well-informed conclusions based on the provided statistical evidence.

Discussion

The discussion section, being a critical component of any research report, can be strengthened by delving deeper into three key aspects:

(a) **What did you find out?** Clearly articulate the key findings of the study, providing a concise summary of the results. This involves a detailed presentation of the discovered relationships, patterns, or trends.

(b) **What does that mean or imply?** Move beyond mere presentation and delve into the implications of the findings. Discuss the practical significance and consequences of the results, linking them to the broader context of the study.

(c) **What studies do your findings agree or disagree with, and why?** Establish connections between your findings and existing literature. Highlight agreements or disagreements with prior research and provide reasoned explanations for these alignments or disparities.

Moreover, ensure that the discussion is firmly grounded in the theories employed in the study. Explicitly associate your findings with the theoretical frameworks used, demonstrating how the results align with or deviate from the expected outcomes based on established theories. This linkage will add depth and coherence to the discussion, reinforcing the theoretical underpinnings of your research.

Conclusion

Adequate

Recommendations

Certainly, to enhance the clarity regarding the contribution to the body of knowledge, it's imperative to explicitly illustrate the alignment or deviation of the study findings from the theories employed. The discussion should delve into specific

instances where the results either confirm or contradict established theories.

In cases where the findings align with theories, the candidate should elucidate the consistencies and provide insights into how the study adds empirical support to existing theoretical frameworks. On the other hand, if contradictions emerge, these should be leveraged as opportunities to contribute to the body of knowledge. The candidate can explore the reasons behind such disparities, potentially uncovering new nuances or variables that were not considered in the existing theories.

By addressing both instances of alignment and deviation, the study not only strengthens its theoretical underpinnings but also contributes meaningfully to the academic discourse. This approach ensures that the research goes beyond mere observation, actively engaging with and augmenting the existing body of knowledge.

Verdict

This is good work and very interesting. I have enjoyed reading it. I recommend it for publication with minor revisions, as indicated in this report. I hope to have done your work fairly and diligently."

I Submit.

Sincerely