

ERI Case Brief #001 — Fashion Commerce

Standard: Expectation vs. Reality Index (ERI)

Methodology Applied: ERI Methodology v1.0 — Fashion Commerce

Confidence Level: Low Confidence

Date of Analysis: 1/22/2026

1. Case Overview

This case brief documents a completed purchase lifecycle in fashion commerce and applies the ERI framework to quantify the gap between documented expectations and material outcomes.

- **Product Category:** Women's Apparel
- **Product Type:** Regular fit top
- **Platform Type:** Marketplace
- **Purchase Channel:** Online
- **Geography:** India

Note: Brand and platform identifiers may be anonymized in accordance with ERI neutrality principles.

2. Documented Expectations (Pre-Purchase)

The following expectations were documented at the point of purchase:

- **Size Information:** Size L; measurements: bust 38 in, waist 34 in, shoulder 15 in, length 25 in
- **Material / Fabric Disclosure:** Rayon (no details provided regarding thickness or quality)
- **Product Imagery Claims:** Casual wear; described as a stylish, long-sleeve top with a tie neck, intended to present a put-together look.

- **Delivery Timeline Promised:** 5 days
- **Return & Refund Policy (as displayed):** 10 days return and exchange (no fees mentioned)
- **Fees Disclosed at Checkout:** Platform fee of 5 rupees

All expectations listed above are based on documented platform information and archived records.

3. Observed Reality (Post-Delivery)

The following outcomes were observed upon delivery and initial usage:

- **Size Accuracy:** Good
- **Material Quality vs Disclosure:** Material confirmed as rayon, consistent with disclosure.
- **Visual Match (color, thickness, cut):** Color appeared darker than the product image; fabric thickness appeared lighter than depicted; cut matched the imagery.
- **Delivery Accuracy:** Delivered within the disclosed timeline.
- **Packaging Condition:** Packed in a small cover with the product folded.

Any observations recorded exclude personal taste or stylistic preference.

4. Reversibility Outcome

Following delivery, a reversal decision was initiated.

- **Return Initiated:** Yes
- **Return Method:** Pickup
- **Return Shipping Cost:** None
- **Non-refundable Platform Fees:** 5 rupees
- **Coupon / Credit Loss:** None
- **Refund Processing Time:** 9 days
- **Net Monetary Loss Incurred:** 5 rupees

This section captures the full reversibility cost as defined under ERI.

5. ERI Component Scoring (Indicative)

5.1 Promise Clarity Score (PCS)

- Assessment Summary: The size, price, return policy, and delivery date were clearly mentioned; however, the platform fee was added at checkout.
- Score (0–100): 65

5.2 Outcome Fidelity Score (OFS)

- Assessment Summary: As material quality was not documented, it could not be independently assessed. The product also deviated from the visual presentation in the imagery. Packaging quality was below expectations for a fashion product.
- Score (0–100): 60

5.3 Reversibility Cost Score (RCS)

- Assessment Summary: The refund process took around 9 days which is almost twice the initial delivery timeline. The platform fee was not refunded upon return of the product.
- Score (0–100): 60

5.4 Repeatability Factor (RF)

- Assessment Summary: Similar material quality variations, refund delays, non-refundable platform fees, and substandard packaging quality have been observed in multiple purchases. Size discrepancies have also been observed in some products purchased on this marketplace. As these instances are not documented within this case, the impact is assessed as low rather than high.
- Score Impact: Low (85-90)

6. Final ERI Score

Composite ERI Score:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ERI} &= (\text{PCS} * 0.25) + (\text{OFS} * 0.35) + (\text{RCS} * 0.25) + (\text{RF} * 0.15) \\ &= (65 * 0.25) + (60 * 0.35) + (60 * 0.25) + (85 * 0.15) \\ &= 16.25 + 21.00 + 15.00 + 12.75 \end{aligned}$$

= 65.00

Interpretation Band: Moderate Gap

Confidence Label: Low Confidence (n < 30)

7. Observations

This case highlights the following measurable aspects:

- Areas where documented expectations were clear or ambiguous
- Specific deviations between promise and outcome
- Economic and procedural implications of reversibility

No recommendations or endorsements are provided.

8. Limitations

- Single lifecycle case
- Limited sample size
- Results should not be generalized beyond this documented instance