

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_83775
Title of the Manuscript:	Ready-made Garments, FDI, and Total Exports of Bangladesh: A Time Series Analysis
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>As the title implies, the article is devoted to a general analysis of exports of finished products from Bangladesh in the framework of certain cooperation projects. However, neither the author's concept nor the existing conceptual provisions "long-term and short-term causal relationships between the export of ready-made clothing, total export earnings and net inflow of foreign direct investment" are presented by the author. Questions remain why this complex technological, economic, social and production process should be carried out right now and in this aspect. For this reason, the relevance of this research topic seems necessary, but not justified by the author.</b>	Best of my knowledge, this is the first study that combines three key factors namely, the RMG sector, FDI inflows, and total exports of Bangladesh. Due to the lack of existing literature, it was not possible to widen the discussion from the theoretical framework. Further, this study aimed to find the impact and significance of these factors in the export earnings of Bangladesh and to show that the study used different time series techniques.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>The abstract of the article is written incorrectly. There is no abstract structure, the main goals are not highlighted, the research methods used, the results obtained, controversial points and conclusions are not reflected.</p> <p>The article should clearly indicate the purpose and objectives, research methodology, analysis of previous studies. Conclusions should reveal all aspects of the study and contain directions for further research.</p> <p>Conclusions should fully reflect the results of the study. These should be expanded to identify several questions for discussion and future research directions.</p>	<p>Incorrect is a strong word regarding the appropriateness of the abstract. The very first line clearly expressed the aim of this study and then pointed main results of the study rather than mentioning a few numbers. The abstract mentioned ARDL, Cointegration tests, and so on. Further, this study is not focusing on problems and solutions but only to find the short-run and long-run interactions among the variables.</p> <p>Finally, the reviewer's comments were helpful and helped to get more insight into this study.</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article should be accepted for publication, specifying its main structural elements and the originality of the findings, as well as the possibility of their practical application.	

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>	