



**SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM**

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>1. Title is too long: The relationships between e-banking service quality and e-customers satisfaction and loyalty.</p> <p>2. The abstract has to be written as a narrative presentation, not by sections.</p> <p>3. To highlight that the questionnaire method is at the base of the analysis.</p> <p>4. In the Conclusions part, derived from the Results, there are no influences in some cases. Therefore, what does the bank management do in order to strengthen the relationships with no visible influences? We understand those results, but what to do to be efficient and indeed customers to be satisfied?</p> <p>5. Attention, not to write the authors into the brackets say something. Example, (Melinda, 2017) They...? Melinda (2017) explains.....or (Budiman, Yulianto &amp; Saifi, 2020) Explain.. No, correct is Budiman, Yulianto &amp; Saifi (2020) explain....</p>	<p>1. Keep in mind if there is one more variable that forgot to mention that is "Convenience of Online Services" and in my opinion the title is quite short</p> <p>2. The template of your journal is intuitive per each section for abstracts and I follow the existing template</p> <p>3. has been emphasized</p> <p>4. Materials have been added</p> <p>5. This is the effect of the automatic reference of ms word</p>