

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_122553
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Service Quality in Automotive After-Sales Service
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>
<p>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>	<p>This manuscript offers a valuable contribution to the understanding of factors influencing customer satisfaction in the automotive after-sales service sector. By applying the SERVQUAL model to the Indonesian context, the authors provide empirical evidence on the relationship between service quality dimensions and customer satisfaction. This research is particularly relevant given the increasing competition in the automotive industry and the growing importance of customer retention. The findings can inform strategic decision-making for automotive companies seeking to enhance their after-sales services.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title, "Evaluation of Service Quality in Automotive After-Sales Service," is suitable as it clearly reflects the content and focus of the study. However, it could be slightly refined to capture the specific context and methodology, such as "Assessing Customer Satisfaction in Automotive After-Sales Service: A SERVQUAL Analysis."</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a general overview of the study, but it lacks specificity in terms of the key findings and the significance of the research. I suggest adding more detail about the results and their implications to make the abstract more comprehensive. Additionally, briefly mentioning the methodology used would help provide a clearer picture of the study's rigor.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally well-organized, facilitating a logical flow of information. However, some sections might benefit from being more explicitly defined or subdivided to improve readability and coherence.</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>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The research design is appropriate for the study's objectives, and the data analysis is thorough and well-executed. The authors have also considered potential limitations and addressed them adequately, which adds to the credibility of the findings. The manuscript's conclusions are well-supported by the evidence presented.</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 references used in the manuscript are sufficient and relevant, covering key studies in the field. However, the inclusion of more recent literature would strengthen the manuscript's foundation. I suggest incorporating studies from the last three to four years to reflect the most current understanding and developments in the field. Empirical studies especially on hypothesis development should be included that explored the relations (independent variables and dependent variable). Comparison with previous studies should also be highlighted in the discussion of results.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, a few grammatical errors and awkward phrasings should be corrected. I recommend a thorough proofreading to ensure that the manuscript meets the high standards expected in academic publications.	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The abstract is generally comprehensive but could be improved for clarity and focus. It effectively outlines the research objectives and methodology but lacks a concise summary of the key findings and their implications. I suggest adding a sentence or two that highlights the main results of the study and how they contribute to the existing body of knowledge on service quality and customer satisfaction.2. The introduction section could be expanded to provide a more detailed background on the research problem.3. Consider expanding the discussion to include potential practical applications of the findings for Honda dealers and the automotive industry in general.	

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:	Tryson Yangailo
Department, University & Country	Zambia