

Check your own Amazon size chart in five minutes

Eight checks, in order. All of them are arithmetic, so none of them is a matter of opinion — you either have the defect or you do not. Every example below is a real defect found on a live listing between 24 and 27 September 2026.

Why we are giving this away. Because the people who will sit down and do this themselves were never going to pay anybody, and the ones who try it on a forty-listing catalogue find out how long it takes. Either way you end up better off, and we would rather be the company that told you how.

The eight checks

1 Are the bands continuous?

Read down one column — chest, say. The number that ends each size should be one unit below the number that starts the next. 92–95, then 96–99. Not 92–95 then 99–103.

REAL EXAMPLE, FOUND ON A LIVE LISTING

Chest: S 92.7–95.2, M 99.1–102.9

Anyone measuring between 95.2 and 99.1 has no size at all — a 3.9 cm hole. She does not email to ask. She rounds down, because the photographs show a close fit, and three weeks later that is a return logged as “too tight”.

2 Do any two sizes overlap?

The opposite failure. If one size ends at 96 and the next starts at 94, then everyone between 94 and 96 fits two sizes and the chart has stopped deciding anything.

REAL EXAMPLE, FOUND ON A LIVE LISTING

Waist: L 91.4–96.5, XL 91.4–101.6

L and XL both start at 91.4, so L has effectively been swallowed. A buyer who measures 93 is being asked to pick at random, and half of those picks are wrong.

3 Does any value end one size and begin the next?

The smallest defect and one of the most common. If S is 32–34 and M is 34–36, then 34 is in both.

REAL EXAMPLE, FOUND ON A LIVE LISTING

Bust (in): S 32–34, M 34–36

A buyer measuring exactly 34 is in two sizes at once and nothing on the page decides it. She guesses down. Move the boundary by one unit and the ambiguity disappears.

4 Are there decimals in the chart?

If yes, the chart was converted from inches and never rebuilt. 34.5 in becomes 87.63 cm; 36.5 in becomes 92.71 cm. The conversion is correct and the chart is still broken.

REAL EXAMPLE, FOUND ON A LIVE LISTING

Chest: 87.63, 92.71, 97.79, 102.87

Nobody measures herself to two decimal places. She measures 93, finds nothing that obviously matches, and rounds to whatever looks closest. The rounding is where the holes come from.

5 Does every column hold different numbers?

Put the waist column beside the hip column and compare them row by row.

REAL EXAMPLE, FOUND ON A LIVE LISTING

Waist 25.5–27.5, Hip 25.5–27.5 – identical in all six sizes

Nobody measured a garment twice and got the same number six times running. One column was copied over the other, almost certainly in a spreadsheet years ago. Which one is the real measurement is something only you know, which is why nobody else can fix this one for you.

6 Does every dimension actually grow?

Read across the range. A length that goes 71, 73, 76, 78 while the waist goes 76 to 112 is not sized — it is a constant with noise on it.

REAL EXAMPLE, FOUND ON A LIVE LISTING

Length: 71.9, 73.9, 76, 78 across five sizes; waist grows 36 cm in the same range

A 2XL customer gets a garment six centimetres longer than the S. On a dress or a jumpsuit that is the difference between fitting and not, and it is not a manufacturing problem.

7 Is the measurement your category is chosen on actually there?

Leggings are returned as tight at the hip, not the waist. Trousers need an inside leg. A one-piece is sized on the wearer's height, because shoulder-to-crotch cannot be adjusted. A bra needs an under-bust.

REAL EXAMPLE, FOUND ON A LIVE LISTING

Leggings listing, columns: Waist, Length. No hip.

The column the buyer would have checked is missing, so she uses the one that is there, and the one that is there is not what the garment fails on.

8 Is there a size chart at all — including behind the link?

Open the listing, then open the *Size Chart* link as well. Amazon hides the chart behind that link on many apparel listings, and a chart that is there but hidden is a different problem from one that does not exist.

REAL EXAMPLE, FOUND ON A LIVE LISTING

Strapless shapewear, 741 ratings, “Frequently returned due to tight fit”, no chart on the page and none behind the link

On a compression garment with nothing to measure against, every buyer is guessing. This one is the easiest to miss, because the page looks complete until you click.

If you found something, here is how to rebuild it

- **Round everything to whole units.**

Whole centimetres, or whole inches if that is what your catalogue uses. Never mix the two in one chart, and never publish a converted decimal.

- **Make the bands continuous.**

Each size starts one unit above where the last one ended. No gaps, no overlaps, no shared boundaries.

- **Split every boundary in favour of the larger size.**

This is the one judgement call in the whole exercise and it is not neutral. A buyer sitting between two sizes currently picks the smaller one, because product photography shows a close fit — and that is precisely the return being reported back to you.

- **Add the missing column, by measuring it.**

Not by estimating it. A wrong measurement is worse than a missing one, because the buyer trusts it.

- **Put the rule in bullet one, where buyers actually read.**

“Measure and compare with the chart. If you are between two sizes, take the larger.”

What this cannot tell you

Whether your garments actually measure what the chart says. Everything above is a check on the *internal consistency* of the numbers you published — it cannot know whether a size L really has a 96 cm chest. If the chart is consistent and returns are still high, the cause is somewhere else: photography, fabric behaviour, or the fit description. Do not let anyone sell you a size-chart fix for a problem that is not in the size chart.