

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_120372
Title of the Manuscript:	EXAMINING SERVQUAL 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

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 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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes , the title effectively reflects the main components of the study while providing enough information about the study. It is concise and descriptive.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract effectively communicates the significance and outcomes of the study while providing a clear understanding of its methodology and findings. I suggest the author add recommendations at the end of the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriately organized but need slight modifications. For example, the results section should be separated from the methods section. I suggest the author add a separate heading for the results section. Additionally, the recommendations should be placed before the suggestions for further research.	
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 manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, as it systematically applies the well-established SERVQUAL model to assess service quality in a higher education setting. The use of a large sample size (297 students) and the application of quantitative analysis through IBM SPSS version 25 ensure the reliability and validity of the findings. The clear differentiation of the five service quality dimensions—tangibles, assurance, reliability, responsiveness, and empathy—provides a comprehensive evaluation of student perceptions. Furthermore, the detailed examination of specific areas needing improvement demonstrates a thorough and practical approach to enhancing service quality in higher education.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. However, the author must correct minor points to follow APA style, such as representing the DOI as a URL (https://doi.org/...). Rewrite to follow in-text citation rules at the beginning of the paragraph. For example, p. 5 (Parasuraman, A et al., 1985) introduced.....this is wrong The correction will be as follows: Parasuraman et al. (1985) introduced...	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes, the language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. However, the author should double-check for minor punctuation errors, such as adding a comma after 'that' on page 5. Additionally, the author should verify the spelling of the headings in Table 8. Some long sentences require improvement for readability.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eman Abdel Reheem Amin
Department, University & Country	Majmaah University, Saudi Arabia