

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_127242
Title of the Manuscript:	The Implementation of a Customer Relationship Management System to Improve BPJS Patient Satisfaction at Penjaringan Health Center
Type of the Article	Manuscript for Journal

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>

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.	The manuscript highlights the critical role of CRM systems in enhancing patient satisfaction in healthcare settings. By examining the impact of organizational communication, customer trust, and commitment on CRM effectiveness, the study provides valuable insights for healthcare providers to improve service delivery and patient experiences.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "The Implementation of a Customer Relationship Management System to Improve BPJS Patient Satisfaction at Penjaringan Health Center" is suitable for the manuscript. It accurately reflects the core focus of the research, which is the implementation and impact of a CRM system on patient satisfaction.	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive and effectively summarizes the key points of the research. It clearly states the research objective, methodology, key findings, and implications. It highlights the importance of CRM systems in enhancing patient satisfaction, the role of organizational communication, customer trust, and commitment, and the positive impact of CRM on patient satisfaction.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate.	
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.	The manuscript provided demonstrates a strong understanding of scientific concepts related to customer satisfaction in healthcare and the potential role of CRM systems. Here's a breakdown of its strengths regarding scientific robustness and technical soundness: Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear Structure • Literature Review • Hypothesis Development • Methodology • Data Analysis Techniques 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	To determine the sufficiency and recency of the references, a thorough review of the provided references is necessary. However, based on the limited information available, I can offer some general observations:	

Review Form 3

:	Sufficiency: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The number of references seems adequate for a research paper of this scope.The references cover various aspects of customer satisfaction, CRM systems, and their impact on healthcare.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the provided manuscript is generally good. The writing is clear and concise, and the academic tone is appropriate.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Amos R
Department, University & Country	Visvesvaraya Technological University, India