

Review of: "Female Youth Unemployment in the GCC Countries"

Matías Daniel Avelino Ferreyra Wachholtz

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear author,

This manuscript develops a relevant topic on female unemployment in the GCC Countries. It could be important in subfields such as social economics and intersectional gender perspectives in the Arab world.

Yet, as I read it, there are methodological issues that would deserve more attention. These are as follows:

1. The manuscript lacks a clear and well-developed objective. What is the purpose or objective of the manuscript? The 'conjecture' and the topic described in the Abstract pointed out some elements for a potential objective, but it still is not clear enough as I read it. A well-developed explicit purpose in the Abstract and the Introduction section would have an impact on the manuscript as a whole.

2. What kind of questions are addressed in this research? Which gap in the scholarly literature is to be filled out? I suggest developing these issues in the Abstract and Introduction as a way to make explicit what is the potential contribution to the scholarly literature, beyond policy implications for reforming labor and social institutions. At the end of the Introduction section, the authors seem to claim exploratory research:

"we explore the research question of whether having flexible labor markets along the neoclassical labor market theory, in presence of a generous social contract, reduces the female youth unemployment rate in the GCC countries."

Hence, it would have exploratory questions. Yet, it is not clear in the Abstract and I suggest putting clear research questions in the first paragraphs of the introduction. It would help the reader to better understand the problem of the manuscript as a whole. This would also facilitate a better understanding of the justification of this manuscript.

3. If it is an exploratory investigation, the author might consider the use of a 'working hypothesis' instead of a 'conjecture'. As suggested by authors such as Stebbins (2000) in exploration, working hypotheses are provisionally accepted as a basis for further research in the hope that tenable knowledge will be produced, even if the hypothesis ultimately fails.

4. In the Conclusion section, I suggest explicitly recovering the main proposition of the manuscript (conjecture-working hypothesis) to give the final considerations regarding the empirical evidence. Has the proposition or conjecture been supported by the evidence?

Regards,

