

The paper seek to do two main things (1) to examine whether minimum wage literature has change after 2009, (2) to investigate whether minimum wage literature has been affected by publication bias and (3) to find whether there exists a genuine effect of minimum wage on employment.

Generally this is an important research in itself and the authors conducted the meta-analysis excellently following the technique as enshrined by MAER-Network. However the authors must identify a specific and concrete research gap to fill in order to make a major contribution to the topic.

The motivation for the paper seems too limited to only the time period. The paper almost fully replicated the paper of Doucouliagos and Stanley (2009). For the fact that they used papers before 2009 is not an enough justification to conduct a research. A paper may be published in 2015 but uses a data that is before the 2000. So I am in doubt whether the choice of the time period when a paper is published will affect the result so much. The results from the paper confirm this doubt as the results are almost similar to results from the Doucouliagos and Stanley's paper. This therefore makes it difficult to see the main contribution of the paper.

These are some of minor comments:

1. Table 1 is not necessary because you have already discussed that in detail in the literature review. Better still this could be put in an appendix.
2. There was no simple average of the elasticities and coefficients to compare the variance between them the meta-average.
3. With some authors churning out more than one paper in the meta-studies, it will be robust to include the author fixed effects.
4. The main conclusion that the once publication bias has been corrected for, there is only a slight (economic insignificant) negative impact on employment seems not to be consistent with the reported elasticities. Since you are looking at elasticities ranging from 1.7% to 3%, these cannot be said to be economically insignificant.