



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_33163
Title of the Manuscript:	Channels of Foreign Remittances and their Relative Efficiency in Sylhet Region of 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	1. The reader doesn't know the aim of the paper. At least one hypothesis should be given by an author and what should be proved there. 2. the summary should be given with some points for future research avenue and some proposals of channels' improvement could be given too (according to their efficiency)	1. To know the aim of the paper, please have a look on Introduction last para (Therefore, the aim of the study is to...). I think that there is no need to specify any hypothesis additionally as there no test is practically carried out. 2. The summary for future research avenue and some proposals of channels improvement were added in the conclusion section (yellow highlighted).
Minor REVISION comments	1. Table 4 does not contribute much to work as it coincides with Table 3, but it can be assumed that it confirms the channels used by the income groups in the study area. 2. The description and analysis is generally done after the table/graph, so the comments begin with "Table 3..." should be below the table, as it is correct as regarding table 4. The same remark concerns table 5 and 6. 3. Conclusions do not bring anything to work, because it is the same repetitions from earlier analyzes. Instead of this, the information on the degree of accomplishment of the goal should be given and maybe about future (more deep) research in this area	1. Table 3 indicates what kind of channels used by the household (number/frequency of channel users discussed in percentage) for receiving foreign remittances and Table 4 indicates how much foreign remittances (amount of remittances discussed in percentage) they received by these channels during the particular period. 2. The description and analysis is given below all the respective tables according to comment. 3. Conclusion has modified according to the revised comment.
Optional/General comments	1. The general topic is interesting. The paper presents additional thinking and relevant outcomes, however some findings are rather obvious. 2. The paper presents an original methodology to approach the study of how remittances are received by the households through different channels; however	3. Necessary Corrections were made



SDI Review Form 1.6

	more deep study could be given too. 3. The assigned score for each efficiency criteria “were based”... - in my opinion instead of “were” the word “was” should be used (the paragraph after table 1). No dot (p. 3.3.1, second paragraph ...channels It...). For this purpose, the total perceived score (PS) of five categories of attributes based on their particular three preferences (efficiency criteria) were determined at first – the same remark as in the second sentence (p. 3.3.2) 4. The sources are modest but the most recent	according to the given comment (yellow highlighted).
--	---	---