

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

Fotios Chatzitheodoridis¹

¹ University of Western Macedonia

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In general, the paper falls within the scope of the journal being submitted. The topic of the paper (Attitude towards business activity risk: evidence using logit models for two groups of OECD countries) is of relevant interest, and to the best of my knowledge, the manuscript describes work with limited originality.

The paper according to the author has as the main objective to make a first approach to the issue related to the aversion to the risk of failure that a person faces when deciding to be an entrepreneur in some OECD countries. The used data are own to the reports of the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM), cover the period 2001-2016 and is the main input for that nonlinear logit probability models that used.

The paper is seeming to be well-organized and structured but, in my opinion, needs significant improvement and must be clearer in many points.

Comments:

1. By what criteria were the specific countries included in the two OECD countries groups? It is very important this selection to be clear because the reader is confused as in many points into the manuscript, seems author to comparing mainly the countries of Latin America with the rest.
2. The formulation of the research hypothesis H0 in the subsection 1.1 (Objectives of this study) is not based directly on the bibliography mentioned in the introduction. How was the author led to it?
3. I suggest to the subsection 1.1 to be add a brief structure of the paper.
4. The originality of the work is not quoted at all (although it is implied due of the two groups of OECD countries examined and the methodology used), either in Introduction section, either in Conclusion or Discussion section. The same I could mention for the contribution of the study. These absences are obvious to the reader.
5. Isn't the period 2001-2016 a period far removed from the present? How representative can the findings be today? In my opinion it is necessary the author to explain why the analysis stopping to 2016.
6. The Discussion section needs improvement, the author do not discuss the results in depth, and repeats the findings from the previous section. Missing the comparison of findings with the results of similar studies international oriented.

7. Also, in the Conclusion section there are general argue from the bibliography and repetitions that we met in the previous sections. Missing proposals for policy implementation or connection of findings with relevant policies.
8. There are no clear research limitations and future research.
9. There are many repetitions in various points of the manuscript. These repetitions add nothing and make the manuscript less clear.