



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_23193
Title of the Manuscript:	Similarities and differences between the CR and HHI as an indicator of market concentration and market power
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	I have read the paper "Similarities and differences between the CR and HHI as an indicator of market concentration and market power" as you requested. I can find no reason to publish the paper. First, it was done much better in 1989 (see attached). Second, I don't really see what this particular implementation of the idea adds to the literature. Third, the article says it determines a "specific mathematical relationship" between the CR and the HHI. It does not. Nowhere does it provide a mathematical relationship. It provides a stochastic relationship. Fourth, the article claims "there is no differences between" the CR and the HHI. Obviously, that's not correct. Fifth, the preference of the HHI over the CR is not simply based on the number of firms in the calculation. The HHI is often computed only with the largest firms, since the smaller firms make little difference. The CR only considers shares, where the HHI considers shares and their variance. Comments received from email	It is not possible to verify the statement that it was done much better in the paper from 1989 since this paper was not attached as stated. Based on additional checks of literature we could not find the evidence that someone has used our approach. Our paper proves that there is no significant difference between HHI and CR, especially if observed at industry branch level. However, we have accepted the reviewer's suggestion regarding the nature of relationship between HHI and CR and instead of "mathematical" we use "regression model", which is particular value of this paper. These corrections are included in the revised version of the paper.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		