

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JERR_100849</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Modeling mass customization level in apparel and textile design field</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Method Article</b>

### **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:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. This manuscript reflect to the technical attributes used in manufacturing activities. It's useful for production orientated discipline.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable.</p> <p>3. This manuscript focus on reviews on mass customization levels, reviewer clearly understand the subject discussed</p> <p>4. There are subsections defined, however, reviewer suggest the arrangement should be neat in order to facilitate the readability.</p> <p>5. No scientific figure involved, but it's appropriate for it discipline and topic discussed.</p> <p>6. Since it more on reviews and modeling some strategy based on level of production, the references are sufficient.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language need o be improved</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Reviewer found difficulties in reading since the paragraphing issues not fixed. Fixed the arrangement, then it will be fined.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>M. N. Ikhsan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Limkokwing University of Creative Technology, Malaysia</b>