

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_124502
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating Customers' Perceptions of the Reliability of Healthcare Services Provided by Government Hospitals: A Case Study of Ilala District Council
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>

Review Form 3

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.	<p>The study is very crucial and relevant since it has the tendency to bring to help bridge the gab between clients and care services across the Africa and the world at large.</p> <p>I liked the manuscript because the author gave significant literature reviews in connection to the topic.</p> <p>However I did not like it because of the following: There were no clear objectives for the study as well as hypothesis to give the reader on what author was expecting. Also, the literature reviews were not thematic making its understanding a bit difficult in terms on which aspect of the topic it was supposed to be. Finally, author stated in the abstract this is a descriptive and quantitative study, however at the methodology session, author mentions quantitative and qualitative approach was employed</p>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is good, however a bit of refinement of changing 'customers' to clients would more appreciate. So I will go for 'Perception of Clients on the Reliability of Healthcare Services delivery. A case study at the Ilala district'.	
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 was good and satisfactory, however it did not prove the right methodology used in the study. It also really address an objective and gap the study filled.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	For what was presented, selections were well placed. However sections on objectives, significance of the study, hypothesis, etc needs to be addressed.	
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>The manuscript address a major issue which has been bothering a lot of clients and care service providers as well as policy makers.</p> <p>It's also correct and significant because less study in Africa addressing clients' satisfaction concerning care services rendered to them.</p> <p>Also, the study is a clear manifestation of how clients view services provided at healthcare providers and has the tendency of helping improve service delivery</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The reference and on point and relevant to the study.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language used was good, however it is best to address care services receivers as clients and not customers.	
Optional/General comments	Generally, this is a great study but has many gaps to be filled to make it more relevant to the scientific community. Author needs to correct the disparities in the methodology, give clear objectives and hypothesis as well as improve on the discussion and recommendations.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<u>Name:</u>	Matthew Frimpong Antwi
<u>Department, University & Country</u>	St. Dominic Catholic Hospital, Ghana