

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_126571
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Customer Relationship Management On Customer Retention In The Sacco Sector In Kenya.</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript provides an insightful examination of the impact of customer relationship management (CRM) on customer retention in Kenya's SACCO sector. The study's focus on service quality, technology adoption, and complaint handling aligns well with current trends in digital transformation and relationship marketing. Such research is significant as it emphasizes how CRM practices can enhance customer retention, thereby supporting SACCOs' stability in a competitive financial landscape.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title is suitable as it accurately reflects the manuscript's focus on CRM and its effects on customer retention in the SACCO sector in Kenya.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract is informative but could benefit from additional detail on the specific findings or conclusions drawn from the study. Consider summarizing key results to provide a more comprehensive view.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The structure is generally appropriate, with clear subsections. However, some sections could be streamlined to avoid redundancy, particularly in the literature review.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, grounded in well-cited theories and empirical research. The study's methodology, though primarily theoretical, is coherent and supported by relevant references, providing a solid foundation for the conclusions.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>The references are adequate and fairly recent. However, including additional studies from the last two years could further strengthen the paper's currency and relevance.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The manuscript generally uses clear language, but minor edits for grammar and syntax would improve its readability and scholarly tone.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Consider including a discussion on the limitations and potential areas for future research to give readers a broader perspective.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jagjot Bhardwaj</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>USA</b>