

Manuscript: **“The Interrelation Between Textile Engineering Graduates’ Results And Their Job Performance In Textile Industry Of Bangladesh”**

Submitted: 19 April 2021

Accepted: 06 July 2021

Published: 31 July 2021

Corresponding Author: Md. Mahbubul Haque

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n25p132

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Dr. A N M Ahmed Ullah, Southeast University, Bangladesh

Reviewer 3: Enriko Ceko, Wisdom University, Albania

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Dr. A N M Ahmed Ullah	
University/Country: Southeast University, Bangladesh	
Date Manuscript Received: 08.05.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 25.05.2021
Manuscript Title: The Interrelation Between Job Performance and Textile Engineering Graduates' Result	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0514/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: 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.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>The Title may be written as- A Study of Correlation Between Job Performance and Textile Engineering Graduates' Result</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The name of Twenty dimensions of quality, No. of Employers should be written in abstract.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3

<i>A few grammatical and spelling mistakes were found.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>HLVQ(Hybrid Learning Vector Quantization)may be mentioned. Figure-1should be readable. Likert charts should be thoroughly checked.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Description of the figures should be placed properly.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The findings of this study should be mentioned clearly.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

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):

Grammatical, Spelling mistakes and Percentages in the Likert scales should be checked again

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Enriko Ceko	
University/Country: Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: 8 th June 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 10 th June 2021
Manuscript Title: The Interrelation Between Textile Engineering Graduates' Results and their Job Performance in Textile Industry of Bangladesh	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	

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>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>Yes. The title is clear and adequate</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objectives, methods and results.	2
<i>Is clear, but don't presents clearly objectives, methods and results</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>No. There are no grammatical errors and spelling mistakes</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The study is explained clearly, but methodology and methods used are not explained clearly and seems to be an empirical study, which in my eyes is evaluated for novels the article brings. The sample taken into the research is too small to achieve results, considering the size of textile industry in the country.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The results are clear, but interpretation is more rigid and explicit than it should be. In such situations, definitive answers and definitive explanations and arguments is difficult to obtain, considering here the small size of sample taken into the consideration.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>The conclusions are very short (there is only one paragraph as a conclusion), not totally accurate (because in such empirical studies no one can deduct and generalize for the whole sector or economy), and, content of the paper supports the conclusion (which “must” be reviewed under the light of empirical studies).</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Yes. They are appropriate.</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The authors should review abstracts to show main objective of the paper, methodology used, method(s) used, results gained.

The authors should stress that this is an empirical study undertaken under specific conditions of the textile industry in the country, under specific conditions of educational system in the country, as well as some assumptions should be included for quality on higher education, legacy and accreditation of diplomas issued for textile studies on country's university programs, the students' score evaluation students is not fictive, etc., like this.

The sample size should be larger to represent the real size of textile industry and real employment of graduated individuals in such sector like textile, which is important for the country

Literature review should be included in the body of the paper directly after introduction.