



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_30840
Title of the Manuscript:	Dynamics of Comparative Advantage and Competitiveness of Textile and Apparel Industry: An Empirical Analysis for China and Bangladesh
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The study is interesting and useful. The author uses a methodology present in the literature. However, it is very weak from the bibliographical point of view. The conclusions should be more discussed. I would add some political reflection on the opportunity to compare these two countries. In addition, I must point out that: - 132: seems to be missing some words - 164: there is a mistake in the reference (the same problem there is at 166, 169, 171) - 203: please check the correct reference (Hubbard, 2002 does not exist) - 220: please insert some appropriate references to sustain advantage and disadvantage of RCA index Please clarify this issue https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Md_Ekram_Hossain/publication/266648599_Competitiveness_of_Textile_and_Apparel_Industry_of_Bangladesh_with_China_in_International_Trade/links/5485e6250cf289302e296353.pdf	Dear Sir, The bibliography has been rearranged and rewritten. Yes, the points you mentioned are corrected. Also references added regarding advantage and disadvantage of RCA index. The mentioned (link) paper was published in conference proceedings in 2013. Though same research methods were used to write that paper, the data used from 2000-2009 as well as analysed 11 products. On the contrary, in our current paper we analysed 14 products of T&A from 2000-2015. In the new paper there have similarity only in methodology. The contents, literatures, findings and policy recommendations are completely dissimilar and in our understanding there have no conflict regarding plagiarism.
Minor REVISION comments	- in the abstract, at conclusion mark, the author refers only to Bangladesh - The author must check the caption and numeration of figures (there are two figures with number1) - The author must check the numbering of the paragraphs	Please go through the abstract and conclusion. These parts are rewritten according to your suggestion.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	-229: please write in correct form the elements of the formula - 226: I think that reference Gauthier, 2001 is inappropriate to explain Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient	The formula rewritten in the correct form. Please check it out in 305 Relevant references are added to explain the Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient. Please go through 302, 303.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This study was published in the proceedings of the International Conference on Information, Business and Education Technology (ICIBIT 2013). see at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Md_Ekram_Hossain/publication/266648599_Competitiveness_of_Textile_and_Apparel_Industry_of_Bangladesh_with_China_in_International_Trade/links/5485e6250cf289302e296353.pdf In google Scholar you can find the paper with this citation: Hossain, M., Huang, D., & Tran, Q. (2013, March). Competitiveness of Textile and Apparel Industry of Bangladesh with China in International Trade. In Proceedings of the 2013 International Conference on Information, Business and Education Technology (ICIBET 2013). Atlantis Press. In the guideline for Peer Review process is declared that "...will consider manuscripts that have been deposited in preprint servers such as arXiv or published in institutional repositories. We will also consider work that has been presented at conferences (Significant amount of changes should be made before submission...)". My opinion is that this is a published paper. Anyway, the paper presented for the review has poor changes respect the original form. I cant know if the authors are the same of this paper...so It's possible a plagiarism.	You are right. Your mentioned paper was published in the conference proceedings in 2013. Though same research methods were used to write that paper, the data used from 2000-2009 as well as analysed for only 11 products. On the contrary, in our current research we analysed all products of T&A (14 products in 2 digit level HS code products of T&A) from 2000-2015. In the new paper there have similarity only in methodology. The contents, literatures, findings and policy recommendations are majorly dissimilar and in our understanding there have no conflict regarding plagiarism (authorship or contents). Authors are also not all same except me and my professor. Thank you for your valuable comments.