

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>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Abstract: a. Before the objective is stated in 1-2 sentences of the problem. b. The researcher can add the result by comparing traditional production methods and implementing lean techniques. c. At the end of paragraph 2, add a contribution Introduction a. The purpose and contribution of this research still need to be visible. It can be added to previous research with the same theme if contradictory studies can be used as res Literature Review Described previous research (references at least ten years back, except basic books as references) The definition of lean can be included in the literature with sub-number 3.2., so as to avoid creating a new sub-number because it is still included. Kind of waste is described, not with points. Methodology In explaining 5 S (better described, not pointers), refer to robust references (from journals or books). You can add the stages from data collection to the conclusion of the suggestion. Each table and figure is given a little explanation in the form of a description of the results and conclusions. Conclusion Refer to the purpose of this paper.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wiwik Sulistiyowati
Department, University & Country	Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia