Report on “Monetary versus non-monetary pro-poor growth: Evidence from rural Ethiopia between 2004 and 2009”

This paper aims to propose a method with which to incorporate non-monetary indicators into usual monetary pro-poor growth analysis. It also offers an empirical illustration for Ethiopia.

The paper starts presenting a list of monetary pro-poor measures that have been proposed in the literature. I have had problems to follow this section. First, the definitions of the measures are often vague or incorrect. For a reader not familiar with these measures, it is very difficult to figure out what the author tries to say. This is the case of the *rate of pro-poor growth*, the *poverty bias of growth*, the *poverty growth curve*, etc. Thus, the rate of *pro-poor growth* involves the use of an index that is not defined, together with the notion of *neutral distributional growth*, which is not explained in the text either. In some cases, the definitions are incorrect. For example, according to the author, *pro-poor growth* is considered to be absolute “if and only if poor people benefit from growth in absolute terms, i.e., the poor benefit from overall growth.” This is inaccurate since it would imply that there is pro-poor growth when, for example, income rises 1€ for the poor and 2€ for the non poor. The discussion on relative and absolute measures also leads to some confusion since they are presented as if only the former focused on both poverty and inequality while absolute measures do also care for inequality. A clear distinction between the absolute and relative concepts of the *pro-poor growth* proposed by Kakwani & Pernia (2000) and their reinterpretations using distributionally neutral growth benchmarks is required (see Osmani, 2005: Defining pro-poor growth. One Pager, 9. Brazilia: UNDP International Poverty Centre). Finally, in this section, it is unclear for the reader why the author wants to present so many measures, especially if they are not later used in the empirical section. There is no discussion on the advantages or disadvantages of these measures that could justify the purpose of this enumeration.

With respect to the methodological novelty of the paper, if I understood it well, what the author proposes is to apply the *non income growth incidence curve* (NIGIC) proposed by Klasen et al. (2008) to population subgroups that are defined according to a non-monetary variable. But I do not think this can be considered a methodological contribution. Any measure can be used for both the whole population and population subgroups. On the other hand, the explanations about how to build these curves for each subgroup should be improved. I do not think that “cohort” is the best word to define any subgroup of households. In addition, it seems to me that the author uses the expression “characteristic k” to refer not to a characteristic but to a given value of the non-income variable according to which the population is being partitioned.

Finally, using the Ethiopian Rural Household Surveys, the empirical section applies the NIGIC for both the whole population and several population subgroups (classified by non-income variables such as household size, household head sex, and household head education). In this section, I miss a discussion about previous works on poverty in Ethiopia. Otherwise, one would think that this is the first paper that analyses this issue. I also miss a discussion on the advantages of using the *composite welfare index* as a non-monetary indicator.