



**Paper: “Identifying and Prioritizing the Performance Criteria of Denim Washing Industry in Bangladesh Using Analytic Hierarchy Process”**

Corresponding Author: Rezaul Karim

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n19p442

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Published: 31.07.2020

# ***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!***

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Prioritizing the performance criteria of denim washing industry in Bangladesh using analytic hierarchy process	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>No</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

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

<i>Questions</i>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><i>The title is almost good. In the abstract authors described the study objectives as follow:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Identify and prioritize performance criteria of denim washing sector,</i></li> <li>- <i>Participate in sectors improvement.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>So, we suggest reviewing the title as follow:</i></p> <p><i>“Identifying and prioritizing the performance criteria of denim washing industry in Bangladesh using Analytic Hierarchy Process”</i></p> <p><i>In addition, we suggest eliminating the second objective because the study did not</i></p>	

<i>bring any tangible outcome that allows sector improvement.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Abstract need more improvement, by adding explanations about methodology adopted and major results and conclusions. The second objective should be eliminated because the study did not bring any tangible outcome that allows sector improvement</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>There are many grammatical errors and some spelling mistakes. A proofreading is necessary.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The methodology is clear and authors have perfectly explained all steps.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The structure follows the ESJ format.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Conclusion is not decisive. It needs some improvement by adding authors' point of view according to results.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>The references are not comprehensive and not appropriate. Authors must review them (using ESJ Author guidelines and Google scholar for example).</i>	
<b><i>Instead of :</i></b> Cheffi, P. K. (2013). Green supply chain performance measurement using the analytic hierarchy process: a comparative analysis of manufacturing organisations. <i>Production Planning &amp; Control</i> , 24(8), 702-720.	
<b><i>Should put :</i></b> Dey, P. K., & Cheffi, W. (2013). Green supply chain performance measurement using the analytic hierarchy process: a comparative analysis of manufacturing organisations. <i>Production Planning &amp; Control</i> , 24(8-9), 702-720. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2012.666859">https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2012.666859</a>	

**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):**