

VIEW COMMENTS FROM EXTERNAL REVIEWER

Project Number : 16600718

Project Title : Physical Capital Measures for China (1952 - today)

PI Name : Prof Holz, Carsten A

Section A : Detailed Comments

1. Please comment on the objective(s) of the proposal, and whether the research agenda adequately addresses the objective(s)?

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

Measures of physical capital are essential for explaining economic growth, investment efficiency, and development policies in economies that have transitioned to markets more generally -- there is a vast lack of knowledge about how to measure physical capital (and its distribution), which is less important in light of Thomas Piketty's "Capital", is the question of whether growing income inequality can be explained by capital accumulation (and labor), which in turn requires a measure of capital itself (and its distribution). In the context of China, the debate on the projects fuelled by credit) can only be captured at the macroeconomic level with this sort of data. A second China-specific model) was to show sectoral variation in capital services and depreciation, and thus variation in investment efficiency. The proposal aims to use the 2009 OECD methodology to calculate capital stock and services values for China since 1952. The transparency of the project by making all data publicly available is a great public service, and one to be commended. Little calculation method.

2. Please comment on the Research Design and Methodology.

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

The investment-based approach to capital stock coupled with the OECD's methods of calculation represent the best practice for measuring capital services. As the PI notes, this measurement strategy has yet to be applied to China. The PI would like to make this measurement well-theorized as possible, avoiding both shortcuts that rely on proxy data as well as ad hoc or unexplained conceptual choices. In the context of research on China, where not only the transparency of underlying (replication) data often leaves a lot to be desired, but also the quality of data is not provided, this is a major research design and methodology advance.

3. Please comment on the feasibility of the proposed research.

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

The PI has already executed this measurement at the provincial level and has shown its feasibility. The only feasibility barrier to overcome is funding should help to overcome.

4. What do you consider to be the most original or innovative aspect of the proposed research? What advances would the research result bring about to the related field if the proposed research is successful?

Comments:

The OECD method is now being widely used. So first we have a best practice measure of capital stock and services. See economic historians with sufficient longitudinal data to take on big picture questions about China's economic developm

5. Please comment on the reasonableness of the proposed budget and manpower planning and project duration.

Comments:

The budget is a pittance. The PI should have asked for more. I have never said this, but it is true in this case.

6. Overall Comments

Overall Comment : Highly worthy project with a small ask, and much to commend it.

Strength: Implementation of best practice measurement with long historical reach and transparency and public sharing o

Weaknesses: None. Except the ask is too small.

Suggested improvements: Maybe think about how to extend this measure to the pre-1949 era.

Section B : Summary of Assessment

The project :

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Scientific/scholarly merit	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Duration Proposed	Too Long <input type="radio"/>	Appropriate <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Too Short <input type="radio"/>		
Impact of Research	High <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Moderate <input type="radio"/>	Low <input type="radio"/>	None <input type="radio"/>	

The principal investigator :

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Ability to undertake the proposal	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Track record in field	Excellent <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Very Good <input type="radio"/>	Good <input type="radio"/>	Fair <input type="radio"/>	Poor <input type="radio"/>

Return