



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	Introduction 1. As it is now, the introduction is not motivating enough; it is as if the authors just thought of a random topic, which happened to be the one spoken of without really coming up with a motivation. It is imperative that a problem statement is included in the introduction. 2. The authors could strengthen the introduction by explaining why they chose to study the T&A industry for Bangladesh and China. They could link the importance of the T&A industry to employment benefits it provides globally. Methodology: 1. I urge the authors to describe in detail how they collected the data and which software they used to analyse both the RCA and the SRCs (r's). 2. As far as I know, WITS is able to provide you with export data for both China and Bangladesh. I do not know why you had to consult other datasets. If the other datasets were indeed used, it is imperative that you inform the reader the use of each dataset and how it complemented the overall study. 3. It is not clear whether you carried out any tests before conducting the SRC analysis. These tests include, 1) whether the 2 variables (in this case, RCA for Bangladesh and RCA for China	Dear Sir, 1. We have restructured the introduction and literature review part of the paper. 2. According to your suggestion, the parts are rewritten. Please have a look at 135-148 and 206-245. Methodology: 1. Please go through 257 to 269, the Data part which could answer this inquiry. 2. We had to use multiple data sources because of data unavailability of some recent years especially for the case of Bangladesh. The authors compiled the data from those mentioned sources to analyse the RCA of Bangladesh's part. 3. You are right; we unconsciously skipped the explanation in this part. We have explained the facts; please go through 523-530. For your concern, to be mentioned; before analysing the SRC, we conducted test to find out the out the monotonic relationship between the two variable and both of them passed



SDI Review Form 1.6

	at all products) are measured either as ordinal, interval or ratio scale; and 2) whether the 2 variables have a monotonic relationship. (see link for more details: https://statistics.laerd.com/spss-tutorials/spearmans-rank-order-correlation-using-spss-statistics.php) these are important assumptions to fulfil such that the results for the SRC are valid. Policy recommendations: 1. The policy recommendations provided are not directly linked with the elaborate results presented instead they are alluded too from previous works. This is not bad but the right way would be to provide your own thoughts on what should be done as seen by your results. If you insist on using other works' policy recommendations then these should be aforementioned in the literature review and then use them to complement your very own policy recommendations. 2. I would therefore suggest that you have a literature section that highlights the combination of works from the T&A industry and those pertaining to RCA especially from a T&A perspective for developed, emerging and developing countries. What you have as literature review fits best as background information.	the test having significant monotonic relationship. We measured the two variables in interval scale having 3 point scale; higher competition, modest competition and complementary. As following, the SRC value ranged from 0.50-1 reveals the higher competition between two nations for the specific product, SRC value ranged from 0.01-0.49 reveals modest competition between two nations for the specific product and SRC value -1 reveals complementary between two nations for the specific product. Policy recommendations: 1. The policy recommendations are rewritten according to your suggestion Please go through 563 to 609. 2. Yes, we followed your suggestion and rewritten and restructured the introduction and literature review part. Please go through; 135 to 148 and 206 to 245 in Introduction and Literature Review part.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Methodology: 1. To strengthen the analysis of RCA, I suggest you adopt other indices in addition to Balassa's for example, the Revealed Symmetric Comparative Advantage, and the net export ratio 2. Overall, the paper requires editing and proof reading. There many contradictory messages especially in the results. For instance, what criteria does the author use to determine that both countries are equally placed advantageous over 3 products. Yet from the results, it is clear that one country has a higher comparative advantage for any given commodity. The author needs to come up with a criterion for having such a result and should be well explained to the reader. 3. Rewrite the second paragraph on page 5.	Methodology: 1. Thank you for your wise suggestion. We will follow the method in our next work. 2. We did proof reading again more times. The assumptions come from the value of RCA as well as the degree of the values which indicates the level of comparative advantage according to the value explanation of RCA in many other existing literatures. 3. The paragraph rewritten.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I commend the authors for using up-to-date citations and references, for presenting results in an interesting manner, and for elaborately presenting the results by product/commodity. Table one should be presented as a graph/figure as it discusses the trend.	You suggestion is followed and the sections are rewritten and the table one presented in graph. Thank you for your valuable comments and suggestions.