

-----Original Message-----

From: XXX YYY<xxx@yyy.zzz>

Sent: Mon, Jul 7, 2014 at 5:33 PM

To: Managing Editor

Subject: Re: Request for editorial decision for manuscript number 2014_AJEA_10726

In my opinion the presented manuscript requires serious revisions and should be rejected. After three rounds of revisions, this work is full of typos that cripple reading and understanding of the presented topic. One of the reviewers raised valuable comments and they were ignored in the final revision.

The presentation of results is below average quality.
I believe that this is not the final formatting; there will be a lot of needed to meet standards of AJEA, eg. Typesetting equations and variables.
Also there is a lack of consistency when presenting results, eg. Table 3 decimals/precision formatting, or precision of income is inconsistent thorough the work (are really those decimals needed?).

Clarity is lacking in Table 1 -2, why counts and % presentation is needed. To demonstrate composition % contributions are much clearer.

Table 5-6, incredible precisions provided for differences. Is 5 decimal places really important?

I also understand that this may be an initial stage of some research work as the study does not search for explanation for observed differences.

However, I am interested in the final version where further analysis is expected to be delivered. I strongly feel that this work is not finished and
Authors ignored many comments from reviewers.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Frantisek Brazdik

Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic

Note: Modification was done in this document ONLY to hide the email id.