

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_110452
Title of the Manuscript:	International factor mobility, rural development policies and wage inequality in the presence of industrial goods as intermediate input in agriculture
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. This manuscript is definitely important for the scientific community. The paper builds a macroeconomic model that explains the difference in wages in the process of structural changes occurring in developing countries. In particular, this applies to the agricultural sector, from where the labor force moves to the sector of industrial intermediate goods. On the basis of the obtained three-sector model, an attempt was made to integrate international factor mobility and the policy of rural subsidies into a single structure of wage inequality in the presence of industrial goods as an intermediate resource in agriculture.</p> <p>2. The name of the manuscript corresponds to the content</p> <p>3. The abstract as a whole is full of content.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript meets the requirements for the presentation of scientific articles.</p> <p>5. The content of the article is generally correct, however, in my opinion, the scientific value of the work would be higher if it were confirmed by empirical data.</p> <p>6. The number and quality of references are generally sufficient, but it would be good to give references to publications after 2016.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Leonid Galchynsky
Department, University & Country	Igor Sikorsky National Technical University of Ukraine, Ukraine