



**Paper: “The Rising Tendency of Migration Among the Young Generation and its Impact on the Bangladeshi Economy”**

**Submitted: 27 October 2025**

**Accepted: 16 December 2025**

**Published: 31 December 2025**

Corresponding Author: Kazi Mohammed Kamal Uddin

Doi: /10.19044/esj.2025.v21n34p164

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Enida Pulaj  
University of Vlora, Albania

Reviewer 2: Gnakabi Yannick Carl Elvis  
Peleforo Gon COULIBALY University of Korhogo, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Blinded

## ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

***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: GNAKABI Yannick Carl Elvis	
University/Country: Peleforo Gon COULIBALY University of Korhogo	
Date Manuscript Received: 18/11/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 25/11/2025
Manuscript Title : <b>The Rising Tendency of Migration Among Young Generation and Its Impact on the Bangladeshi Economy</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 20221-Article Text-59196-1-4-20251118.docx	
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]
-----------	---

<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	4/5
The title accurately reflects the core theme of the paper (youth migration and its economic impact). It is clear, relevant, and aligned with the scope of the manuscript. A minor improvement could be made by making it slightly more concise.	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	3/5
The abstract is detailed and covers objectives, theoretical model, methodology, and key findings. However, it omits certain methodological inconsistencies present in the full text (e.g., mismatch between results and statistical tables). A clearer distinction between perceived and empirical impacts would strengthen it.	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	3/5
The English is generally understandable, but the manuscript contains stylistic heaviness, overly long sentences, and minor phrasing issues. The journal does not require proofreading, but language improvements would enhance clarity.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	2/5
<p>The authors provide a detailed methodology and justify the use of PLS-SEM. However, important methodological concerns remain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• misclassification of indicators (push/pull),</li> <li>• unclear justification for the moderation model,</li> <li>• insufficient detail on stratified sampling,</li> <li>• figures referenced but not included.</li> </ul> <p>These issues reduce methodological clarity.</p>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	1/5
<p>The results section is comprehensive, yet several major inconsistencies appear between the narrative interpretations and the coefficients reported in the appendix. Multiple paths are misinterpreted, and these contradictions undermine the reliability of the findings. These issues must be resolved before the manuscript can be considered for publication.</p> <p>There are inconsistencies in the numbering of the results sections. Please review and harmonize the numbering to ensure that headings, subheadings, and referenced figures or tables follow a coherent and logical sequence.</p>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	2/5
The conclusions are relevant and relate to the findings, but because certain results are inconsistently interpreted, the conclusion partially rests on unstable interpretations. The section is also overly long and would benefit from greater concision.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	3/5

References are rich, updated, and appropriate for the topic. However, some sources do not fully comply with APA 7 requirements (e.g., missing URLs, inconsistencies in capitalization). These are minor issues.

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Your manuscript addresses an important and timely topic, and the use of PLS-SEM and contemporary migration theories shows strong academic intention. However, the paper in its current form requires substantial revision before it can be considered for publication.

First, the overall structure is excessively long (41 pages) and resembles a thesis chapter more than a journal article. Journal articles typically follow a concise structure (Introduction – Literature Review and Theoretical Framework – Methodology – Results – Discussion – Conclusion and Recommendations) and do not include “chapters” or overly detailed subsections. The conclusion, in particular, should not contain internal subheadings. A major reduction and restructuring are necessary.

Second, there are inconsistencies between the results described in the text and the coefficients reported in the tables. Some paths are interpreted in the opposite direction of what the statistical tables show. This undermines the validity of the findings and must be corrected by revisiting the analysis and ensuring consistency between the narrative and the statistical outputs.

Third, the conceptual model and hypotheses are overly complex for a journal article. The number of hypotheses is excessive, and some constructs (e.g., government policy moderation, Theory of Planned Behavior) are insufficiently justified or not operationalized in the measurement model. Clarifying the theoretical framework and simplifying the hypotheses would strengthen the paper significantly.

Fourth, the literature review is too long and includes a large summary table that is not necessary for an empirical article. Condensing this section and removing or reducing the table will improve the readability and focus of the manuscript.

Additionally, several figures referenced in the text (structural model, measurement model, conceptual framework) are missing and must be inserted. Some measurement items also appear incorrectly classified between push and pull factors in the outer loadings table.

Finally, while the English is understandable, the manuscript would benefit from language refinement, removal of repetitions, and clearer transitions between sections.

Overall, the manuscript has potential, but it requires major restructuring, methodological clarification, and substantial shortening to meet journal standards.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**