Paper: **"Human-Machine Collaboration as a Factor of Labour Productivity and Efficiency"**

Corresponding Author: Vera Komarova

Peer review:

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Valentin Marian Antohi	Email:
University/Country: Dunarea de Jos of Galati/Romania	
Date Manuscript Received:05.05.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 06.05.2020
Manuscript Title: HUMAN-MACHINE COLLABORATION AS A FACTOR OF LABOUR PRODUCTIVITY AND EFFICIENCY	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0518/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:Yes You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
The title of the paper is adequate.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
The research method and the objectivesare not presented in the abstract.The results presented in the abstract are not correlated to the conclusions.	

3. **There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**	5
The article is generally well written. As I am not a native English speaker, I am unable to correct the grammatical errors.	
4. **The study methods are explained clearly.**	3
The methodology is well written and argued, but presenting the body of the paper, in accordance with the introduction, methods, results, and discussion (IMRAD) structure.	
5. **The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**	4
Presenting the body of the paper, in accordance with the introduction, methods, results, and discussion (IMRAD) structure. Minor language revision is required.The objectives are missing from the introduction, work hypotheses are not presented or demonstrated in the results chapter.	
6. **The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.**	4
The conclusion part does not specify the limitations of the study.	
7. **The references are comprehensive and appropriate.**	5
The bibliographical sources are adequate.	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	**x**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: ***SzczepanFigiel***	Email:
University/Country: ***University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn, Poland***	
Date Manuscript Received:***2020.05.05***	Date Review Report Submitted: ***2020.05.14***
Manuscript Title: ***HUMAN-MACHINE COLLABORATION AS A FACTOR OF LABOUR PRODUCTIVITY AND EFFICIENCY***	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ***0518/20***	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: ***Yes***	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:***Yes*** You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:***Yes***	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
The title is clear and consistent with the content of the article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
The data used and methods applied in the analysis could be better elicited. The last sentence of the abstract is sort of awkwardly long and it should be reedited.	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
The article is well written and the Authors' thoughts are clearly expressed.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
This element could be improved. This refers both to terminology and analytics. For example, the Authors tried to distinguish "productivity" from "efficiency" without clear description how those categories (by the way they are both, although quite different, economic concepts) can be measured. See figure 5, where one can see something not fullydefined, i.e. what could be in the numerator when saying "per employee". Also, use of the simple linear regression and Pearson correlation should better justified regarding their use to analyze nominal data such as "digital skills among population" and "quality of vocational training".	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
The body of the paper is clear. The linear graphs presented in figures 1 and 4 , should be rescaled (vertical axis) to eliminate empty area below minimum values of the observations analyzed.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
This part of the article is somewhat disappointing. In fact, it is mainly consisting of final remarks rather than conclusions, which are supposed to meet certain methodological standards of logical reasoning to be called "conclusions". It should be rewritten giving special focus to answering the research questions and pointing out related implications.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
The list of references is extensive. Probably it could be reduced slightly with no harm to the article's message. But this is up to the Authors.	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	**X**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Productivity and efficiency are different terms and economic concepts. It is at least debatable how they can "merge". Depending how we measure and analytically compare these categories we can maybe find some similarities but not identity. In general, productivity it is an output-input relationship whereas efficiency is a relative assessment (for more see the text of a milestone article: Farrell M.J. 1957. The measurement of productive efficiency. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. 120: 253-281). Nothing to say, that economic efficiency can be understood much broadly than just productive efficiency.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The article is interesting, timely, provoking to think, and truly interdisciplinary, therefore it should be published in spite of some theoretical and conceptual deficiencies.