

Paper: “Executing Quality Management Tools to Enhance Customer’s Journey at a Clothes Laundry Firm”

Submitted: 19 July 2023

Accepted: 06 October 2023

Published: 31 October 2023

Corresponding Author: Mohammed Alshahrani

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n28p89](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n28p89)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nikolett Deutsch
Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Emine Koca
Ankara Haci Bayram Veli University, Turkey

Reviewer 3: Berenyi Laszlo
University of Miskolc, Hungary

Reviewer 4: Luca Scaini
Al Akhawayn University, Morocco

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear and reflects the content of the paper.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is in line with the content of the paper and clearly presents the objects, methods and results of the research. However, the originality of the manuscript and the validation of the results are missing or even impossible.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Only a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes can be found in the manuscript - i.e., a language check is recommended.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The presentation of sampling, data, and methodology is fair and explained clearly.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The structure of the paper is straightforward, however the literature review, in general, is superficial, tables and figures are numerous, and the manuscript is built around one example. The paper rather serves as a case study for educational purposes than as an article with notable scientific results. Moreover, the article is too long, the authors wanted to show too much, that is why the body of the paper needs further development and restructuring.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Conclusion and recommendation are accurate, however, it is important to note that key findings, results and recommendations are case-specific meaning that the originality of the study (and the importance of the use of different methods and models) is not confirmed. The validation of the results is challenging.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Referencing and quotation meet the formal requirements.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper deals with an interesting topic. The abstract is acceptable. The literature review is superficial and the whole paper serves as one case study. It is to note that the recommended article length is 7-20 pages, meaning that the manuscript needs a complete restructuring. Methods are acceptable and explained. Own results should be compared to previous literature results are neglected and should be better highlighted. Conclusion and recommendations must be reconsidered. Limitations should be added to the text. In sum, the paper needs further improvement and major revisions.

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes, I find the title appropriated to the paper's content.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes, the abstract is well structured and includes purpose, design and methodology, findings and contributions to research (originality).

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The article is well written in English, only small amendments are needed.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes, the study used the mixed method: a qualitative analysis using focus groups and a quantitative analysis using a survey. Both are properly described.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

I could not detect any error from a methodological standpoint. The paper is clear, it reads easily.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes, I find the Conclusion well written.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes, there are 28 references listed.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title well describes the content, it is correct.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract uses a structured approach. It shows all relevant information.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

A final check is required; some typos (small-block capital letters, unnecessary spaces) have remained. There are no serious issues.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Method selection and description is correct.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper gives a detailed presentation of the work. It is comprehensive. The paper is quite long; maybe the final appendix is unnecessary. The illustrations are good in content but very difficult to read. These should be reconsidered, maybe keeping the main points and adding the sub-points in the text. A larger font size would be required in the figures.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Conclusions are in line with the analysis, I can accept it.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references includes relevant sources, I can accept it.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Make a final check and proofread the text.
Consider changing the illustrations.

Reviewer E:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Not rerally. It sounds a bit trivial, and more likely a student's essay than a formal academic paper.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Not very clear: what is the academic and practical purpose? The findings are not well explained, and at least to me, it is not clear what has been discovered. The whole abstract is really poorly explained.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The grammar is weird, it really needs a revision.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

It is a good hybrid method, but it is not clear why the authors decided to use both methods, how they are interconnected. Also, the quantitative method is a bit "skinny" and not really well explained.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

it is clear, technically speaking all infos are well elaborated, but the discussion and the analysis is almost absent.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

This is the weakest part. a very poor analysis leads to inconsistent and very trivial conclusions, without any realistic practical connection. Moreover the limitations and improvements are not outlined.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

OK

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer F:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract should be arranged in such a way as to briefly state the results of the research.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are no grammatical errors or spelling errors in this article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The method is not clear and understandable. The study is systematically weak, which makes it difficult to understand. Although the measurement tools applied in the study and the path followed are quite detailed, the methods and findings are mixed and contain repetitions. For example; The functions of quality management tools are repeated both in the text and in the discussion section. The methodology followed and the tools applied should be explained systematically under the method heading. maybe the method can be given in a schematic way.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The content of the text is not clear and understandable. Numerous diagrams are included in the text, but no explanation of the data is provided. The diagram has been defined. However, the diagram should explain which data tells what to what extent. that is, the diagram must be read. The tree diagrams should be read and the questions of what the desired level of detail is and how it was achieved should be answered. A series of consecutive diagrams with no explanation makes the subject difficult to understand.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The results achieved should be presented systematically. The results obtained from the 5 aspects should be explained clearly and briefly.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Although the study contains quite a lot of data, it has systematic deficiencies. Arranging it according to the suggestions stated on the text will increase the clarity and scientific value of the article.
