

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Arts &amp; Social Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_120372
Title of the Manuscript:	EXAMINING SERVIQUAL MODEL ON STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF SUSTAINABLE SERVICE QUALITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION – A CASE OF TANZANIA INSTITUTE OF ACCOUNTANCY SINGIDA CAMPUS
Type of the Article	

#### **General guideline for 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 guideline for 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**

<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)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I appreciate the authors' initiative on exploring the importance of measuring satisfaction using ServQual model. However, it could have been better if they followed the standard model of computing for quality gaps (expectations minus perceived quality). Or, they might have adopted it but failed to explain the paper. The findings can be a basis for improvement by the school covered in the study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<b>STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS ON SUSTAINABLE SERVICE QUALITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION USING SERVQUAL MODEL– A CASE OF TANZANIA INSTITUTE OF ACCOUNTANCY SINGIDA CAMPUS</b>	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	One liner or sentence that would highlight the rationale of the paper is highly recommended.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Some main sections and subsections are redundant and overlapping. There are sections that can be merged for better organization and presentation of ideas. See comments in the text. There are major revisions on this aspect, but manageable if the authors can follow the journal's format.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper is highly researched with sufficient sources to back-up authors arguments. It advocates potential follow-up studies relevant to the nature and scope of the paper. Meanwhile, it lacks clarity on the aims and purpose of the paper that makes it hard to assess its technicality, novelty and relevance to the existing educational practice. The qualitative approach was also limited knowing that the authors claim using case studies and mixed methods approach. The results and discussion are limited to quantitative analysis.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Most of the articles cited are updated, some need to be omitted as they are already too old. Must be 2014 and up.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are parts in the "Discussion" that need to be refined to sound more scholarly.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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>Bernardo E. Bay</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Lyceum of the Philippines University, Philippines</b>