

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_101700
Title of the Manuscript:	Applying lean tools to improve the sewing line efficiency: A case study
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:

<https://www.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. This Paper explains how organizations can embrace a lean culture to raise workplace productivity and efficiency thereby reducing waste.</p> <p>2. Overall, the title mentioned is brief, informative, and clear. Therefore, the title is of the Article is suitable.</p> <p>3. This is a good abstract which is <i>clear, concise, and critical</i>; providing a succinct overview of how the study was conducted, what it found, and what it means for practice. Hence it is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes it Gives a logical flow to the content, Makes journal manuscripts consistent and easy to read, Provides a "map" so that readers can quickly find content of interest</p> <p>5. Yes this in a way relates to applied science, or uses the methods of science.</p> <p>6. The author has relied on 10 old references which is sufficient. But he has not included the latest journal happening in this area.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The scholarly communication for research evaluation is adequate.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Good Article</p>	

PART 2:

	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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rishi JP
Department, University & Country	Vidyavardhaka College of Engineering, India