Review of: "Fashion and Its Environmental Impact: A Behavioural Physiology Validation of Fashion Influencers' Buying Decisions and Its Perceived Social Impact on Consumer Choices"

Vikas Gupta[1]

1 University of the South Pacific

Dear Authors,

I have the following comments to the manuscript:

1. The abstract of the study requires major modification and doesn't provide a proper representation of what exactly the author/s want to convey through their study. Please remember abstract is the soul of any research article. Provide only the most important statements about your objectives and the unique contribution of your paper in this section. You should also provide a better statement for the methodology you used in the research. Please identify an overarching theory for your research framework. This will also help you with theoretical contributions...

2. Please follow Qeios author guidelines. For example, the manuscript word count is should be accordingly.

3. Please check if there are related papers published in the past two years in Qeios that you can cite.

4. The Introduction seems fairly reasonable, however I encourage to include more studies in the niche but upcoming research field of this domain. Given the standard of this journal, a bit more effort could be done on this front. I encourage you take the approach of solving a theoretical puzzle instead. Which theoretical puzzle are you going to solve? Sounds like you need to cover some weaknesses in your data, hence do reserved-engineering and cherry-pick whatever multidisciplinary things cross your path…). I strongly recommend do a better job at this front.

5. The literature review is very piecemeal and lacks depth and contribution to the reader understanding the domain and what has been done and how that work has developed. There are very frequent gaps in the statements provided in this section. Your reference should also be updated with current and very recent studies done in this domain. I suggest you work on a strategy for what you want to convey and the depth of the presentation of material and broaden its scope. You are missing a lot of work that has appeared over the past few years on this domain. I highly encourage the authors to take a bit less "Masters' students approach" here, but be more provocative, theoretical and counter-intuitive. More scholarly. Also, tie the separate sections better with the front and back end. Finally, you could also do a better job on contextualization.

6. Methodology-Methodology lacks vigor. There are major issues with the methodology.. Author/s did not provided any brief on how data analysis was performed.. How you have evaluated the different methods before coming to the conclusion of choosing your method ?? Author/s should provide a details about these aspects as well....

7. The implications are problematic and require a massive overhaul. Based on your findings, how are you shaking some feathers in the theoretical domains - particularly the ones you claim to use? How will the theories be refined, following your study?

8. I do find the result analysis to be over-engineered. You need to present your results properly by aligning them with your study objectives... Presentation of data in tables may also be improved by providing proper descriptors.. It needs to be more clear and follow brevity over elaboration... At this moment your tables looks extremely simple and didn't provide any extensive data presentation... Also, in some of your result presentation, you are throwing everything in when not needed.

9. There are frequent grammatical and punctuation errors in the manuscript which makes it hard for the reviewer to follow the manuscript.. Use the online available tools to make your manuscript more crisp and succinct which suits the readership of Qeios as a journal... I would suggest you to download some articles from Qeios and follow their writing style and way of presentation... It will help you in making your study better...

A lot of work is still required in this manuscript to be considered further