

Review of: "Analysis of Interconnectedness in Indian Subcontinent Remittances from the Gulf Cooperation Countries"

Ahmed Muneeb Mehta¹

¹ Hailey College of Banking and Finance, University of the Punjab, Pakistan

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Comments to the Author

Literature Review: The literature review is broad but lacks recent studies on remittance flows and labor market dynamics from 2022 and beyond. Including more contemporary research will make the review more relevant. Additionally, the review should emphasize how this study contributes uniquely to the ongoing discourse on remittances and interconnectedness in the Indian subcontinent, as this is currently underdeveloped.

Methodology: The methodological approach (BK connectedness) is appropriate, but the explanation lacks detail. Why was this particular method chosen over other common approaches, such as time-domain models? Additionally, the discussion around exogenous variables and cross-sectional correlations requires more elaboration. Were any robustness checks conducted to ensure the validity of the findings?

Results & Analysis: The presentation of the results is adequate, but the analysis lacks sufficient depth. The results could be linked more clearly to the research objectives and the broader literature. For example, the finding that remittances are largely country-specific should be analyzed in light of existing studies on labor market substitutability and remittance volatility.

Discussion: While the discussion mentions important themes like "structural rigidities" and "quota systems," it does not provide enough practical insights for policymakers. Consider offering more actionable policy recommendations, especially regarding how labor-sending countries can manage remittance inflows in light of labor market rigidities.

Structure & Style: The structure of the paper is generally sound, but there are several areas where the writing could be improved. There are grammatical errors, and some sections lack clarity, making it difficult for the reader to follow the argument. Additionally, the referencing is inconsistent, with a few in-text citations missing from the reference list.

Future Research: The avenues for future research are mentioned but not sufficiently explored. Consider offering more detailed suggestions on how future studies could build on your findings, particularly in the context of different labor market policies or other geographic regions.

