

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_126596
Title of the Manuscript:	Public Service Quality Of Student Creativity Development Programme AT UPA PKK Gorontalo State University
Type of the Article	Research paper

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript offers valuable insights for the scientific community by examining the quality of public services in a university setting, particularly focusing on the support services provided to students in developing creativity and entrepreneurial skills. The study's emphasis on service quality dimensions—such as Tangible, Empathy, Reliability, Responsiveness, and Assurance—is significant because it addresses key factors that directly affect student satisfaction and engagement in university programs. By identifying areas where service quality could be improved, the study can guide similar institutions in enhancing their student support strategies, making it a useful reference for educational administrators and policymakers.</p> <p>I appreciate this manuscript's detailed approach to evaluating service quality through qualitative data collection, as it brings to light practical issues faced by students, like insufficient resources and limited technological support. However, the analysis could be strengthened by incorporating quantitative data to provide a more comprehensive perspective on service outcomes.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article, "Public Service Quality of Student Creativity Development Programme at UPA PKK Gorontalo State University," is generally suitable, as it indicates the study's focus on service quality within a specific university program. However, it could be slightly refined for clarity and impact. For instance, an alternative title might be:</p> <p>"Evaluating Public Service Quality in Student Creativity and Entrepreneurship Development at Gorontalo State University"</p> <p>This revised title better highlights both the program's purpose (creativity and entrepreneurship) and the focus on service quality evaluation, making it more appealing to readers interested in educational support services and public service management in academic settings.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is largely comprehensive, covering the main objectives, methods, and key findings. However, a few improvements could make it clearer and more informative:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Objectives Clarification: Begin by clearly stating the purpose of evaluating service quality for the student creativity development program, emphasizing the relevance of each dimension (Tangible, Empathy, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance) to the study's objectives. Methods Expansion: Briefly mention the qualitative approach in more specific terms, such as the sample size or types of participants involved (e.g., students, faculty) if applicable. This would give readers a clearer understanding of the study's scope. Results Summary: While the abstract includes main findings, it would benefit from more specific insights. For example, you could specify any notable areas for improvement (like lack of technological support) and positive areas (such as responsiveness or assurance) to provide a balanced summary. Implications or Recommendations: Adding one sentence about the broader implications of the findings (e.g., how this can improve student satisfaction and engagement in similar settings) would strengthen the abstract by showing its relevance beyond Gorontalo State University. <p>These adjustments would make the abstract more comprehensive and help potential readers quickly grasp the study's value and findings.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript's structure and use of subsections are generally appropriate, following a logical flow that makes it accessible to readers. It begins with an Abstract that summarizes the study, followed by an Introduction that contextualizes the importance of service quality in public service, especially in an academic setting. This leads effectively into the Materials and Methods section, which describes the qualitative approach, including data collection techniques like observation, interviews, and documentation.</p> <p>However, there are a few areas for possible improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Results and Discussion: Combining results and discussion in one section is common, but separating them could provide clearer focus. Presenting the findings independently from their analysis might help readers better distinguish between observed data and interpretations. 	

Review Form 3

	<p>2. Use of Subsections within Results: The Results and Discussion section could benefit from additional subsections that clearly address each service quality dimension (Tangible, Empathy, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance) separately. This would make it easier to follow the findings related to each aspect of service quality.</p> <p>3. Conclusion and Recommendations: The Conclusion section could be expanded with a brief subsection on Recommendations to outline specific actions for improving service quality based on the findings.</p> <p>Overall, the structure is appropriate but could be enhanced by clearly delineating sections and using additional subsections within the results to emphasize key points systematically.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness by adhering to a structured research methodology that includes clear objectives, systematic data collection, and detailed analysis. Its use of well-established service quality dimensions—such as Tangible, Empathy, Reliability, Responsiveness, and Assurance—aligns with existing frameworks in service quality research, lending credibility and relevance to its approach. The qualitative data collected through observation, interviews, and documentation strengthens the study, as it provides in-depth insights directly from stakeholders involved in the student creativity program. Additionally, the findings are discussed in a way that ties back to the theoretical framework, supporting the study's conclusions and demonstrating that it is technically sound and methodologically thorough.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:-</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript cover relevant foundational theories and concepts in public service and service quality, citing recognized authors like Parasuraman for the service quality dimensions. However, a few additional and more recent references would strengthen the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recent studies on public service quality: Including studies from the past five years on service quality, particularly in higher education, would provide a more up-to-date perspective. Examples could be recent articles in journals like <i>Public Administration Review</i> or <i>Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management</i>. 2. Technological Impact on Service Quality: Since the study mentions challenges with technology and information systems, references to recent work on digital service delivery in higher education (such as studies on e-service quality or digital transformation in public services) could add depth. 3. Current Trends in Higher Education Service Quality: Incorporating recent studies on student satisfaction and public service innovations in universities from journals like <i>Studies in Higher Education</i> or <i>Educational Research Review</i> would support the relevance of findings and situate the research within current trends. <p>Adding these references would make the study more robust by situating it within contemporary research and highlighting recent developments in public service quality and student engagement.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally understandable, but there are areas that need improvement for it to meet scholarly standards. Some sentences are overly complex or contain grammatical errors, which may make the content harder to follow. Additionally, certain technical terms and phrasing could be clarified to improve readability and ensure precise communication of ideas. Refining the language to improve clarity, coherence, and flow would make the manuscript more suitable for academic publication. A professional language edit or proofreading session focusing on grammar, sentence structure, and academic phrasing would help enhance its readability and ensure it meets the standards expected in scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

Review Form 3

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:	Silvia Elena Iacob
Department, University & Country	Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania