

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_127383
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of the Influence of Experiential Value and Relationship Quality on Customer Loyalty (Case Study on RDM Tourism Bus)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Enhancing customer service, strengthening relationships, and continuously improving app features, innovations, promotions, and service systems are essential for maintaining customer satisfaction and loyalty in the tourist bus industry. Hence this manuscript is inevitable for our scientific community to improve the facility of the same.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is coined suitably.	
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.	Please expand ROI. It was mentioned that all hypotheses in this study were accepted; please give quantitative evidence.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Inference from the literature is not mentioned. Methodology part need to improve and support graphical or flow chart. Analysis and result are not sufficiently written with their fit indices and finally the result of the analysis was not mentioned properly. Example final casual loop diagram must be drawn for the SEM analysis.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes, However, request to check the spelling, grammars and typo errors. Example. Section 2.1 Experimental value.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Required some more quantitative results with their fit indices to justify the analysis and their results.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ponnurangam P
Department, University & Country	India