

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

Evans Kulu

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Generally, the study tackles an interesting topic that will catch attention of many readers given its novelty. However, there are many issues with the general write up that needs to be addressed. Thus, the entire paper requires a proof reading while other special technicalities need attention. I have summarized my main issues as follows:

ABSTRACT

- Abstract is too voluminous. It needs to be summarized
- The word “and” should be introduced before the last item when making a list. For instance, in the second sentence of the abstract, the word “and “ is overused.
- It is important that sentences are kept as short as possible to make a clear meaning. At best, no sentence should be up to three lines.

METHODS

- Check for some grammatical errors and misplaced punctuations. For instance, “The paper employed a mixed methods....”. Also, “The paper adopted a mixed research design approach that involved primary and secondary data collection techniques. that was based on.....”
- The sentence “The paper adopted a mixed research design approach that involved primary and secondary data collection techniques. that was based on documentary analysis and review of previous literature review of theoretical and empirical studies on institutional development and how the process influences and is influenced by democratization and socioeconomic development (gauged by economic growth), which was complemented by results of interviews with academics, public policy practitioners, constitutional development experts, democracy and socioeconomic development pundits and institutionists that were conducted via email; and regression analysis.”, is too long. Consider rewriting this and some other sentences that have more than three lines. They are difficult to be understood.
- The estimation technique used for the regression analysis should be mentioned. Also, the models for the regressions need to be specified in the methods section.

RESULTS

- Check for wrongly spellings. For instance, “Thai” instead of “the”
- The results should be discussed not in isolation with the literature. That also implies that a bit of focus should be giving

to reviewing of empirical literature.

- Refer to my earlier comments on too long sentences. They appear to be very visible in the work.