



Paper: “An Integrated QFD-FEA Framework for Evaluation of Nigeria Garment Designs”

Corresponding Author: Opaleye Adepeju

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n13p348

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Luca Scaini
Al Akhawayn University, Morocco

Published: 31.05.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Luca Scaini	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 21/3	Date Review Report Submitted: 1/04
Manuscript Title: What Do Consumers Really Want From Nigerian Garment /Designs?	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 88.02.20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
The title is clear and explains well, but it expressed in a trivial and pop way. I advise a more professional and academically captivating wording (especially without “really want”)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	4

results.	
The abstract is clear and well written.I would advise to suggest outcomes.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
Clear and correct. The form can be improved. I suggest to avoid “we cannot find”, “We have”, “We did” and similar forms. I feel like it would be better to use a less narrative form. “it has not been found”, e.g.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
Yes, but under Literature review it should not take place the QFD. It should be explained in the methodology of research. Literature review makes not much sense, written without a review of the literature. The methodology itself is very clear.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
Clear, captivating, interesting and easy to be followed, for a audience of a certain mid-high level and aware of the subject.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
Very limitative. No future improvements, recommendations, limitations, that instead are present in the paper itself. It absolutely required to add these sections and to explain.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	x
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear authors, this is an interesting reading. I suggest to review the narrative form in some part, improve the literature review that is actually practically absent and to add the missing parts: limitations and future improvements.