

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_SAJSSSE_129734 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Analysis of the Impact of Service Quality, Facilities, and Trust on Public Satisfaction as Users of Ahmad Yani Park in Medan |
| 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>

PART 1: 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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | | |
| 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. | | |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | | |
| Optional/General comments | <p>Interesting topic, and has been a public concern so far.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. The method of determining respondents unintentionally, requires a deeper explanation with clear references, because there are many studies that use the deliberate respondent method, especially those related to green open spaces.3. The research findings based on the variables analyzed do not seem to be specific, such as explaining the level of service satisfaction, facility improvements, cleanliness and beauty, this standard description does not need research to be seen. Specific indicators are needed to measure, for example, the level of service satisfaction, what are the dominant and specific indicators, as well as other variables, for example, the beauty of plants related to the park to attract visitors and so on.4. The regression results table is too crowded, it is better to display points related to the discussion only.5. I did not find any conclusions as a result of the discussion in this paper, like the results of scientific research in general. <p>Conclusion. Revision is needed</p> | |

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: | Aris Sakkar Dollah |
| Department, University & Country | Bosowa University, Indonesia |