

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEMT_103414</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>What makes Bangladeshi RMG Suppliers Resilient in Global Apparel Supply Chain Management?</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The paper has an interesting topic and method and totally I Suggest that for publishing.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes, the topic and area of study could be important and interesting for scientific community.</li> <li>2. Yes, it is good.</li> <li>3. Yes, didn't find any problem in abstract structure and it supports the whole paper.</li> <li>4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</li> <li>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</li> <li>6. The reference is sufficient but suggests some new and more additional references to update and validate of the article more.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	Yes, the language quality is good enough for scholarly communications.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The abstract could be more summarized.	

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ismael Rezaeinejad</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>People's Friendship University of Russia, Russia</b>