

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_99143
Title of the Manuscript:	Service Quality Model Towards Passenger Satisfaction at Sultan Hasanuddin Makassar International Airport
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

Review Form 1.7

(<https://www.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript is important but not scientific. My justifications are embedded below</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The abstract is not comprehensive</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The manuscript is not scientifically correct</p> <p>The references are not sufficient. The citations are not sufficient, in fact it is poor.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Detailed Review Abstract section The abstract should be in prose writing format if not sectionalized. The author should not number the research study aims. Abstract should also contain major findings and recommendations. The discussion on methodology is too short. Keywords has different text font. "Strong approach" should be deleted. Identify the research approach and research design used. Introduction section In the line 1, Vocational Education will be written as it is if it will be abbreviated as (VE), otherwise, it should be Vocational education. There is no need to capitalize the beginning of each words. There is no reflection of vocationalization in the title. Hence, issues of vocation may confuse the reader. You may need to expunge it. The study lacks proper and sufficient citations. The first paragraph should be expunged. It has no meaning in the title. The author should focus on the subject matter only (Service quality and satisfaction). The entire introduction needs to be reworked. Literature review section This should contain the review of existing studies. The necessary ingredients are really missing. Methods section Provide justifications for choosing the Sultan Hasanuddin Makassar International Airport. Provide justification for using ex-post factor. Research design is not addressed. Data analysis is not scientific. Data results are not stated. If you will use regression, the regression table must be presented.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adetayo O. Adeniran
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Technology, Nigeria

Review Form 1.7