

# ANNALS OF ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS

Arnaud Maurel  
Duke University  
Department of Economics  
213 Social Sciences Building  
Durham, NC 27708, USA  
email: arnaud.maurel@duke.edu

March 4, 2021

Dear Luca:

I am writing with regards to your manuscript “Gender Gaps in Latin American Labor Markets: Implications from an Estimated Search Model” (joint with M. Tejada, C. Piras and M. Bustelo, MS 2020034R1) which you have resubmitted to *Annals of Economics and Statistics*. I have read in detail the revised version of the paper, along with your responses to the comments that the referees and I had in the previous round. Overall, I think you’ve done a very good job with the revision and have satisfactorily addressed the main concerns we had on the initial version of your manuscript. I believe this a very nice paper which will make a valuable contribution to the literature, and **I am happy to accept your paper** for publication in the special of *Annals of Economics and Statistics* on Advances in Structural Microeconometrics.

There are a couple of points I would like you to take into account before moving on to the production stage. Namely:

- I came across several typos as I was reading the paper. I list a few examples below, but there may be others. Please carefully proofread the paper before sending us the final version:
  - p.3, second paragraph: “It” missing in “(..) is important”.
  - p.6, discussion below Eq. (2): “he” missing from “(...) receives flow utility”.
  - p.10, beginning of second paragraph: “labor marker”.
  - p.13, second paragraph: “that it it does”.
  - p.2, second paragraph: not a typo per se, but the statement “(...) their reduction may cause and at the same time magnify (...)” is difficult to follow.
- I realize that you’ve already shortened the body of the paper quite a bit, but for the special issue we’re trying to get as close as possible to a 30-page limit, excluding the references but including the tables and figures. Here a few suggestions that should help cutting down 2 more pages or so:
  - The discussion of the counterfactual experiments in Section 6.2 is interesting, but a bit lengthy at times. You might be able to shorten this part a bit without losing much of the main substance of the discussions.
  - The conclusion could probably be a bit shorter too.

- You might also be able to merge some of the graphs. For instance, you could potentially report Figures 8 and 9 on the same page, as you did with Figure 10.

Thank you again for submitting your engaging work to *Annals of Economics and Statistics*. I look forward to seeing your article appear in print.

Best wishes,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Arnaud Maurel', with a stylized, flowing script.

Arnaud Maurel

Co-Editor, *Annals of Economics and Statistics*