



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_19772
Title of the Manuscript:	Economic Activity of Population in the Ukrainian Labor Market:Nonlinear Smooth Transition Model
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Presented article is a good example of speculation on ignorance of the potential readers. The author proposed to consider the labor market of Ukraine, as an ideal, forgetting that he feels strong pressure from the labor market in Russia and Europe, which offer more favorable conditions. Thus, the most active representatives of the workers prefer to work in these markets. None of this is not taken into account in the model.	Thank you for your comments. Of course the problem of external migration labor resources is vital for Ukraine. On the recommendation of reviewer I additionally noted this in the introduction (Lines 29—34 in revised paper). But in my article and also in the model that I built I studied the economic activity of population specifically on the labor market in Ukraine.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The author needs to highlight more clearly exactly what the variables are put into the model, and the results .	I specified the variables that I included into the model and in the results in Lines 152—165 in revised paper.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In addition, it is desirable to bring the article to the conventional form, highlighting the separate section "Literature review" and "Discussion", as well as to decode all the abbreviations and collect them in a list	I introduced the designation decode the abbreviations in Lines 152—165 and 192—193 in revised paper. Section "Literature review" and "Discussion" I suggested in Lines 64 and 492—517. Thank you for your interesting ideas and helpful advices.