

Manuscript: "Challenges To Sustainable Supply Chain Management And Their Interrelation In The Apparel Sector Of Bangladesh: A Dematel Approach"

Submitted: 02 December 2020

Accepted: 27 April 2021 Published: 31 May 2021

Corresponding Author: Md. Rezaul Karim

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n15p409

Peer review:

Reviewer 1:Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Prof. Dr. Engr. Ayub Nabi Khan, BGMEA University of Fashion &

Technology (BUFT)

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!

Reviewer Name: Prof. Dr. Engr. Ayub Nabi Khan			
University/Country: BGMEA University of Fashion & Technology (BUFT)			
Date Manuscript Received: March 12, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: April 01, 2021		
Manuscript Title: CHALLENGES TO SUSTAINABLE SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT AND THEIR INTERRELATION IN THE APPAREL SECTOR OF BANGLADESH: A DEMATEL APPROACH			
ESJ Manuscript Number:			
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No YES			
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No YES You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No YES			

Evaluation Criteria:

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

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]		
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5		
The title is appropriate and clear to the content of the article.			
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4		

The abstract is properly explained and presented with well metheods and results	defined objects,
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
No Grammatical error found	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
Study methods are explained scientifically and correctly	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The results are explained logically and clearly	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
Conclusions and summary are written accurately which is supcontents.	ported by the
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The references are written as per international standard and a	ire appropriate

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation):

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

