

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_87299
Title of the Manuscript:	Financial distress and its prediction: A case study of the textile and garment industry
Type of the Article	Case study

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.journalajebea.com/index.php/AJEBA/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The literature review section is very short. You only refer to a few sources in general, but you do not present studies by other authors that have addressed the problem presented in your study. At least a few such studies, the methods used in them and the results of these studies should be referred to. You can also look for inspiration abroad. There should also be more information at the introduction of the article, information should be added about the covid-19 situation and its impact on the sector.	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Your paper has obviously been written before. For example, it refers in its introduction to the fact that the clothing and textile industries can make a comeback by repurposing its products as PPE. Is this statement still valid? All restrictions on the covid-19 are now being lifted around the world, and drapes are no longer mandatory in some countries. A year or two ago, it would have been a good move for these companies, but today the world is changing again. Was it not possible to use newer data? 2. It would be a good idea to specify the purpose of your study and ideally define research questions or hypotheses that would support the scientific nature of your study. 3. It is not stated which version of Z-Score was used, respectively, why this version was used (there are several). 4. What software was used for the calculations? This should also be stated. 	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jakub Horak
Department, University & Country	Institute of Technology and Business in Ceske Budejovice, Czech Republic