



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_15017
Title of the Manuscript:	Corruption Effects on Private Enterprises Productivity in Developing Countries: Firm Level Evidence from Burkina Faso
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	(1) Why the authors select only the data of 2011, rather than data of more one year? (2) Because the authors measure the enterprises productivity using SME's annual added value, but the index measures the firm growth in some papers, I suggest that enterprises productivity may be revised as firm growth. (3) Because corruption is only the dependent variable of the first-stage regression in TSPLS, Corruption is not the dependent variable in the paper. (4) It's worth asking whether that "(iii) the entrepreneur's company received government contracts in 2011" is viewed as corruption, if it is true, we may think all companies received government contracts in 2011 exercised the bribes. (5) I suggest the authors may list a table about the regression result of the first-stage regression in TSPLS in the paper.	Thanks for all the comments (1) The used data are primary ones of only one passage. There are no other databases of many years that will enable us to deal with these questions. The only database is the one that we have used. (2) For input quantities used equally for two enterprises <i>i</i> and <i>j</i>, if the firm <i>i</i> achieves an added value more important than the firm <i>j</i>, we can say that the firm <i>i</i> is more productive than the firm <i>j</i>. Our study focuses on that point. Indeed, we can use the added value as a measure of the enterprise's growth. But in this case, data of at least two periods are needed. Other authors also use the added value as a measure of the enterprise's size. By using the added value as size, we make hypothesis that small enterprises carry out small added values and the big enterprises achieve great added values. It has been recommended to do so when we deal with data of a manufacturing industry where



SDI Review Form 1.6

		there are as well very big enterprises as small ones. At this time, the added value is a good proxy of the enterprise's size. In the country where we carry out the study, the public demand represents more than 70% of the global demand. Therefore, a small enterprise that gets more public contracts (for instance due to corruption), can carry out more added value than a big enterprise that doesn't get any contract. For all these reasons, we propose that the word « productivity » be retained instead of « growth ». (3) include in the text (line 305 to 311) (4) The corruption variable is built as follows: 1. An enterprise is said to be corrupt if the owner says to have given bribes to get government procurement in 2011. We know that other entrepreneurs will conceal the truth and give false answers to this question. To get to know them, other questions have been asked in the questionnaire. To identify the corrupt enterprises (that refuse to reveal themselves) we have
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		proceeded as follows: (i) If the entrepreneur thinks that it is impossible to receive government contracts in Burkina Faso without paying bribes, (ii) and he (she) thinks that the competitors have always given bribes to secure government contracts and (iii) his (her) enterprise got government contracts in 2011. We conclude that he (she) also has given bribes to obtain public contracts. This is to say that an entrepreneur who thinks that one can be allotted of government procurements without given bribes, and who also thinks that his/her competitors honestly get their public procurements, then that entrepreneur cannot be seen as corrupt, even if his/her enterprise has got government procurements. (4) include in the text (appendix)
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	(1) “In the first column of table 2 ” , namely in the first line of the last paragraph on page 12 should be “In the first column of table 3”, there is some of this error in the paper, please check them. (2)It is very difficult to distinguish the two lines in Graph 1 and Graph 2. (3)The logic of literature review and quality of presentation of English language is not good.	(1) and (2) are include in the text (3) The spelling of the text is corrected by AJE. That does not mean that the English is correct.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There is some questions about typesetting.	Many thanks