

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_127147
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative Study of Decadal Labour Share for Indian Manufacturing Industries
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This research offers the scientific community valuable insight into the gap between rising productivity (real net value added) and still wage growth in India's manufacturing sector. By highlighting how these wage disparities hinder the potential of labor-intensive industries, it brings to light a need for strategies that ensure fairer wage distribution. This perspective is especially relevant in India because without addressing wage disparities, the potential to fully leverage labor-intensive manufacturing and exports in India remains constrained.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "A Comparative Study of Decadal Labour Share for Indian Manufacturing Industries," does a good job capturing the essence of the study.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is clear and does a solid job of covering the study's methodology, and findings. To give readers a full picture, a brief mention of the study's implications for labor policy would round it out nicely.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Structure and Subsections: The manuscript is organized well, and the subsections guide readers through the flow of analysis. That said, a few tweaks could enhance readability and impact:</p> <p>Introduction and Literature Review: The introduction could clearly outline the motivation behind this decadal analysis and explain the significance of understanding labor share trends in India's manufacturing sector. Expanding the literature review to delve a bit more into key findings and debates from prior studies would also be helpful.</p> <p>Methodology: A more intuitive explanation of the labor share calculations, with simpler terms or examples, would make this section more accessible. Also, giving readers a clear rationale behind specific analytical approaches (like aggregate vs. per-worker analysis) would make it easier to understand the author's reasoning. The author can also mention any limitations of the ASI dataset to add up transparency.</p> <p>Graph Arrangement and Interpretation: The graphs effectively convey decadal trends, but integrating them more closely within relevant text sections could make it easier for readers to connect the visuals with the analysis. Including detailed captions or brief explanations would enhance the flow and understanding.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>To strengthen scientific robustness, the Methodology should clarify calculations for labor productivity, real wage growth, and labor share, detailing how real net value added is normalized per worker. Adding an Error Analysis in the Results by presenting labor share growth with a mean and standard deviation (e.g., Decade 1: Mean = 0.75, SD = ±0.03) would enhance trend reliability. Expanding the Discussion to link post-liberalization labor share declines to broader economic impacts would deepen the study's practical relevance.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references are generally sufficient and include a number of relevant studies on labor economics and productivity within India. I suggest the author adds more recent references, particularly those focused on post-liberalization impacts on labor markets and wage distribution, to strengthen the contextual relevance.</p> <p>I suggest that the author includes references that focus on methodologies for calculating labor productivity, real wage growth, and labor share to greatly improve the scientific thoroughness of this manuscript. I believe that referencing works that discuss best practices for handling long-term data</p>	

Review Form 3

	trends would further justify the methodological approach and enhance transparency.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor Revision Comments Language/ English Quality: The author's language is mostly clear, but some sentences could benefit from refinement to improve readability, particularly in the methodology section.	
Optional/General comments	The research provides valuable insights into the wage disparities within India's manufacturing sector, which hinder its growth potential. It effectively highlights the need for fairer wage distribution to unlock the full potential of labor-intensive industries. A brief mention of policy implications and more accessible methodology explanations would further enhance the study's impact and clarity.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sam Rex Sagoe Babo
Department, University & Country	Ghana