Paper: **"Nutritional Impact on the Productivity of Ready-Made Garment Workers"**

Corresponding Author: Md. Monirul Islam

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Rajasekhar Kali Venkata
University of Hyderabad, India

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022*

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. Venkata Rajasekhar Kali	
University/Country: University of Hyderabad, India.	
Date Manuscript Received: 4ᵗʰ Jan, 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 9ᵗʰ Jan, 2023
Manuscript Title: Nutritional Impact on the Productivity of Ready-Made Garment Workers	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**

(Please insert your comments)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**3**
(Please insert your comments)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**2**
Yes, few errors are there.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**
Study methods did not include the limitations for the study, like motivation for additional food etc.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**3**
Yes, results are okay.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**3**
Yes, the conclusions seems to be supported by the results.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
Yes	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	**Minor revision(comments noted in the manuscript)**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It is not advisable to include 'he' while writing a journal article, it would be ideal to write as individual or person

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: No comments for editors.