

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

Atanas Sixpence

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Reviewer Suggestions

### Preamble

The purpose of this review is to proffer suggestions that I feel may improve the paper. This paper focuses on how a country's political, economic, social systems, and cultural fabric influence the nature, form, and quality of institutions, and how the interdependence of the relationships influences development outcomes. Three ASEAN countries are used as case studies (Indonesia, Philippines, and Thailand).

The review is divided according to the paper's main sections. However, before going into the various sections, note that the paper has no standalone literature review section. Literature review is critical in order to identify the knowledge gaps that exist (which this study aims to fill), and also to acquaint readers with the current state of knowledge in the subject area. Thus, it may be helpful to consider having a literature review section.

### Abstract

The abstract provides all the pertinent issues. However, it seems to be a bit too long mainly because of so much detail given on the findings. The abstract should just whet the reader's appetite to read the paper by highlighting only the key findings. Also, consider incorporating the main implications of the study and limitations; this makes the abstract more informative.

### Introduction

- i. There are some citations with direct quotations but they do not show the page numbers from which they are drawn. Most citation conventions require the inclusion of page numbers for all direct quotations.
- ii. It is critical to cite very recent literature. There are instances where research that was done way back, say in 2004, is the most 'recent' study cited (page 3, third paragraph with these citations; (Li & Reuveny, 2004; Przeworski, 2004a; Przeworski, 2004b; Przeworski and Limongi, 1993; Przeworski et al.2000; Helliwell, 1994; Bukhart and Lewis-Beck,

1994; Barro, 1999; Barro, 1997). The problem with such a scenario is that there may be recent findings which go against what the study is based on, making the whole study archaic. To be contemporary, findings within the last ten years are necessary.

## Methods

No specific suggestions.

## Results

- i. For regression results to be credible, check if your results are robust and report the robustness measures adopted.
- ii. The regression results tables appear much better if the results are first imported into Excel, draw the table in Excel and then export the table to the document. This is just a presentation suggestion.
- iii. You may also consider re-arranging your results presentation such that after presenting and analysing one country's regression results, you also present and analyse results from desktop study and interviews for that particular country in the same section. This makes it easy to compare and contrast your findings from the different data sources and analysis methods used.

## Discussion

- i. Some minor editing issues, e.g. the second line under the discussion repeats Indonesia (one should be Thailand).
- ii. A discussion should be more oriented towards comparison of the study's findings with literature. There is very little comparison with literature, presumably because the paper does not have a literature review section. Furthermore, a discussion should also delve into other possible explanations of the findings of the study other than those related to the problem of the study, i.e. what could have influenced the observed phenomena? You thus discuss those factors and weigh their contextual applicability.

## Conclusion and Implications

No suggestions.

