

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_118978
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring for the change in change of employment status over time.
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>General Comments</p> <p>From my point of view, it is a very interesting topic and simultaneously it seems that to the best of my knowledge is an important study seeks to explore for presence of dissimilar developmental paths in employment status of American individuals. The empirical longitudinal exercise is conducted with hybrid latent class growth model and latent class growth mixtures. For testing the hypothesis of heterogeneous subgroups within employment status data three mainstream modelling variants of growth modelling are tested and elaborated in terms of model performance. Progressive employment status based typology is found robust to alternative model specifications voting for presence of clustered growth patterns in experiencing employment status over time. The typology describes three clusters of active, inactive and mediocre active participants in terms of moving between various stages of employment status for the age span of 18 years to 35 years i.e., from adult to post adult prime working life years.</p> <p>The paper consists of the sections: Introduction, Methodology, Results, Typology of change in ES, Conclusion and Policy Implications.</p> <p>However, I find some recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract must contain the main purpose of the paper, the research method used in the research and the main contributions. 2. It would be very useful to add in the "Introduction" section the purpose, objectives and hypothesis of the research. 3. The Literature review section cannot be missing from the paper and must be presented separately from the Introduction section. 4. We consider that the introduction should specify the novelty of the paper compared to other papers published in this area. 5. The research is well based on science and the results are in agreement with the theoretical part. From my point of view, the paper is original and the topic addressed brings added value to the specialized literature regarding development. The paper is well written and easy to read. 6. The research is well based on science and the results are in agreement with the theoretical part. The model applied to the analyzed data is correctly used in the analysis undertaken, it is a strength point of this paper. 7. Another important cause that must be mentioned in the paper is the link between GDP, fiscal compliance and shadow economy, as the independent variables fiscal compliance and shadow economy strongly influence GDP. In this sense, I recommend the authors to quote the paper: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Batrancea L., Nichita A., Batrancea I., Gaban L. (2018). „The Strength of the Relationship Between Shadow Economy and Corruption: Evidence from a Worldwide Country-Sample”. Social Indicators Research, 138(3), 1119-1143; DOI: 10.1007/s11205-017-1696-z <p>We recommend the authors to number the paragraphs: 1. Introduction; 2. Literature Review; 3. Methods and Results, Discussions and Conclusions.</p> <p>In conclusion, the article should be thoroughly rebuilt (changes in structure recommended above). It should also be enhanced with a review of the literature adequate to the subject and a broader interpretation and commentary of the research results.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	The Manuscript needs careful English proofreading because there are some shortcomings. For instance, the article "the" is sometimes missing in front of nouns, the message in some paragraphs is not clear enough.	

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:	Batrancea Larissa Margareta
Department, University & Country	Babes-Bolyai University, Romania