

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JERR_117954
Title of the Manuscript:	Customer satisfaction in concrete distribution
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is this manuscript important to the scientific community? This manuscript is important to the scientific community because it addresses the issue of customer satisfaction in concrete distribution, which is a critical component in urban construction. An in-depth analysis of the influence of customer satisfaction on vehicle scheduling and priority distribution for large customers provides new insights into improving the efficiency and long-term profitability of companies in this sector. 2. Is the article title suitable? The title of the article "Customer satisfaction in concrete distribution" effectively reflects the content of the manuscript but could be more specific. An alternative title that could be considered is "Improving Customer Satisfaction through Effective Concrete Distribution Strategies" which more directly indicates the main focus of the research. 3. Is the article abstract comprehensive? The abstract provides a good general overview of the content of the article, including the research problem, objectives and implications of the research. However, the abstract could be enriched by adding key results to provide a better understanding of the contribution of this research. 4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? The structure of the manuscript is well organized with clear subsections that support the flow of the argument. However, some subsections require further development to ensure that readers can easily follow the progress and logic of the research. For example, to provide more specific feedback about comments on subsections and manuscript structure, you could explain as follows: "The structure of this manuscript is well organized, dividing the research into logical subsections such as Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion. However, in the 'Methods' section, details about the data analysis techniques are not sufficiently explained, which may make it difficult for readers to understand how to conclude taken. To increase clarity, it is recommended to add a more detailed subsection regarding the research design and statistical approach used. In addition, in the 'Discussion' subsection, it would be useful if the authors could compare the findings of this study with existing literature in more depth, to show how these results expand our understanding of the topic." 5. Do you think this manuscript is scientifically correct? This manuscript appears to be scientifically correct in its approach, but requires further research and validation of the methods used. Additional details about the methodology and data analysis would be helpful in verifying the scientific accuracy of this study. 6. Are the references sufficient and up to date? If you have additional reference suggestions, please indicate them in the review form. The reference list seems adequate but not completely up to date. The addition of recent studies related to customer satisfaction and distribution logistics could enrich the theoretical basis of the manuscript. Additional references that can be considered, for example, are the latest articles from journals that discuss the latest technology in logistics and supply chain management that can increase customer satisfaction in concrete distribution. <p>1. Compliance with Publication Criteria: Add sufficient references to sections discussing general theory and methodology.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Introduction and Background of Customer Satisfaction Theory:</p> <p>This section reviews various customer satisfaction theories and indices that have been developed and used in various countries. There is a discussion of how customer satisfaction is measured and its influence on purchasing behavior and satisfaction with services or products.</p> <p>Research methodology:</p> <p>In this section, the authors discuss the customer satisfaction models used to schedule concrete distribution and how they analyze data related to customer satisfaction in the context of concrete distribution.</p> <p>Both sections require stronger and more detailed references to ensure the authenticity of the research and to support the claims made. Due to the lack of adequate references, there are concerns that some content may be too general or not sufficiently credited to the original source, which could lead to plagiarism issues. It is best to use a plagiarism detection tool to ensure the authenticity of the manuscript and check that all theories and methodologies discussed have been given proper attribution.</p> <p>2. Clarity and English Quality: The language in the manuscript is generally clear, but there are several grammatical and punctuation errors that need correction to improve clarity. The authors are advised to use language enhancement services if necessary.</p> <p>3. Research Integrity and Ethics: No glaring ethical issues emerge from this initial review. However, the authors must ensure that all studies involving human respondents have obtained appropriate ethical approval, if applicable.</p> <p>4. Justification and References to Existing Literature: The manuscript attempts to link customer satisfaction theory to concrete distribution, which is an intriguing approach. However, the authors need to include more current and relevant references to support their arguments and to demonstrate the relevance of their research to the existing literature.</p> <p>5. Novelty and Contribution to the Field: The topic of customer satisfaction in concrete distribution is a promising area for research. However, the authors need to highlight the novelty and unique contributions of their research to this field to meet the journal's novelty criteria.</p> <p>Recommendation: Accepted with Major Revision: The manuscript requires significant improvements in methodology, data presentation, and enhancement of literature references. The authors should substantially revise this manuscript before it is considered for publication.</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Clarity and English Quality: The language in the manuscript is generally clear, but there are several grammatical and punctuation errors that need correction to improve clarity. The authors are advised to use language enhancement services if necessary	
Optional/General comments	Recommendation: Accepted with Major Revision: The manuscript requires significant improvements in methodology, data presentation, and enhancement of literature references. The authors should substantially revise this manuscript before it is considered for publication.	

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:	Renil Septiano
Department, University & Country	Universitas Putra Indonesia, Indonesia