

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</a>
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	

#### 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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This manuscript makes a substantive contribution to the scientific community by studying influence of Customer Relationship Management system on BPJS patient satisfaction, especially the most essential element in health services offered within the republic of Indonesia. The research follows a strict quantitative method and utilizes SEM to reveal, under a specific analysis framework, the key factors-organizational communication, customer trust, and commitment-and their effects on CRM effectiveness. I appreciate this manuscript structured approach since it offers insightful value in improving quality health care through technology and trust building, hence relevant for future studies on health care management.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is appropriate	
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.	Overall, the abstract is good but some things remain to be done in terms of including some data points, a bit more detail regarding the features of the CRM system, and practical recommendations for improvements. It would make all the difference if the study provides such a clear picture of rigour and practical application for the readers.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript structure appears well articulated and suitable for a scientific piece. Here's an analysis of the subsections and structure:  <b>Strengths:</b> <b>Logical Flow:</b> The manuscript follows a logical structure by having a proper sequence from Abstract to Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology, Results and Discussion, finally to Conclusion. This is the most followed format in scientific studies and hence tracing the research process by the reader is very easy.  <b>Thorough Literature Review:</b> The Literature Review is very well structured, and there are all the essential concepts like customer satisfaction, organizational communication, customer trust, and commitment that serve as an excellent base theory for the study.  <b>Elaborative Methodology:</b> The Methodology consists of research design, method of sampling, process of data collection, and analysis technique to add transparency to the study.  <b>Results and Discussion:</b> The section is further divided into subheadings on the analysis of individual variables related to organizational communication, customer trust, and commitment and its relationship with CRM system effectiveness toward customer satisfaction. Systematic analysis of this type makes it easier to	

**Review Form 3**

	<p>judge individual contribution of each such factor.</p> <p><b>Areas for Improvement:</b>  <b>Hypothesis Integration:</b> While the hypotheses are stated in the Literature Review, it would be more apparent to combine all of them into a separate subsection before the results section; otherwise, it is unclear which hypothesis is being supported or not and why.</p> <p><b>Conclusion Section:</b> In the Conclusion, it should be remarked that a separate subsection will list the specific practical implications and actual limitations of the study so that the theoretical results can be mapped into real life conditions as well, besides discussing the biases of the study along with areas of further research.</p> <p><b>Visual Elements:</b> Use figures, tables, or a flowchart to represent the relationships between the variables talked about in the Results, that would work best to clarify and analyze difficult relationships, if not already provided.</p> <p>On the whole, the manuscript is structured correctly. Hopes are that making hypotheses visible and expanding the discussion on practical implications may be added to it.</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>Because of the elaborate research design and rigorous methodology applied within, the manuscript is scientifically sound and technically valid. The application of SEM in the analysis of relationships among the variables used- more specifically, communication within the organization, trust, commitment, and effectiveness of CRM- demonstrates a sophisticated application of statistical methodology. A sample size of 200 BPJS patients has been drawn upon to ensure a reliable basis for generalization of the results. The study includes a well-validated instrument in measuring constructs, such as Cronbach's Alpha that would be used for testing the reliability aspect of the construct; this increases the validity of its findings. Its clear alignment with its hypotheses and results further support its scientific rigor.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The manuscript contains quite a number of references, among them foundational theories as well as recent studies that are of significance to the study. References are spread across crucial areas- among them, customer satisfaction, CRM systems, organizational communication, and trust, to mention just a few. Most of the references date from 2021-2023, which goes to indicate the relevance of the manuscript towards the present trends in research.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>On the standard of language, the article generally lent itself to academic discourse. The manuscript was written in formal academic language, and the research was presented in a logical and clear flow. There are instances where one could improve the writing to make it more concise for better clarity and flow:</p> <p>Sentence Composition: Some of the sentences are quite long or unwieldy and may probably have an impact on the readability thereof. Division of such lengthy sentences into shorter, punchier ones will enhance clarity.</p> <p>Technical Terms: Technical terms can be used, but some places call for defining a few core terms that have an average reader utterly unfamiliar with them, like the CRM system characteristics.</p> <p>Grammar and Style: There are a couple of minor grammatical errors and convoluted sentence structures. The manuscript should be proof-read to ensure consistent verb tense, subject-verb agreement, and better transitions between ideas.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

**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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Dipti Baghel
Department, University & Country	Dr. K.C. Baghel Govt PG College, India