

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_128924
Title of the Manuscript:	The Influence of Police Officer Competence on Community Satisfaction Through Public Service Quality in Driver's Licence Services at Limboto Police Station
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: 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.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it explores the critical interplay between the competence of police officers, the quality of public services, and community satisfaction in a specific public service domain. Its offering an actionable insights for improving citizen-centered service delivery systems, making it highly relevant for policymakers and practitioners.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear and descriptive but to make it more concise and engaging to attract a broader audience I would suggest the following: "Enhancing community satisfaction in driver's license services: the role of police officer competence and public service quality at Limboto Police Station".	

Review Form 3

<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 is generally comprehensive, but it can benefit from some adjustments to improve clarity, structure, and conciseness. Below are my suggestions:</p> <p>additions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • briefly explain why the study is important and its broader implications for public administration or governance. • clearly state the research objectives in one concise sentence. • simplify the key findings by highlighting the most significant findings without overloading with detailed statistical results, which can be reserved for the main text. <p>deletions or modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoid excessive numerical details (e.g., SEM-PLS equations) as they are not necessary for an abstract. Instead, summarize the key insights derived from the data. • break down complex or fragmented sentences for better readability. 	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The research approach and design are appropriate for investigating the relationships between the variables and the methods adhere to standard practices for quantitative research, but certain details are missing that are crucial for reproducibility on the materials and methods section. Below are my suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide detailed descriptions of data collection instruments, sampling techniques, and participant characteristics, and inclusion/exclusion criteria. • clarify ethical considerations and approval processes for the study. • include information on how SEM-PLS model parameters (e.g., path coefficients, R² values) will be interpreted to address the research questions, and which software was used for analysis. <p>The data appears well-controlled, and the authors have applied standard validity and reliability tests to ensure the robustness of their constructs. All indicators and variables meet the required thresholds, which supports the reliability of the results.</p> <p>My suggestion for improvements:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • while the R-squared values for the models are explained, elaborate on whether the observed values (e.g., 0.159 and 0.724) meet thresholds for strong or weak relationships in similar contexts and discuss practical implications of the variance explained by the models (e.g., what does 15.9% explain in real-world terms for public service quality?). • clearly distinguish between significant and non-significant effects in both tables and narrative explanations. And for the rejected hypothesis, provide potential explanations or discuss why the competence of police officers does not significantly affect community satisfaction directly but does so indirectly through public service quality. • interpret statistical results in the context of existing literature and practical relevance. For example, explain why public service quality has a dominant effect compared to police officer competence and what this means for improving community satisfaction. • provide quantitative data to support claims. For instance, when discussing the positive impact of police officers' competence on service quality, add specific metrics or survey findings to reinforce the claim. • if survey data exists on public satisfaction or service quality improvements, these should be integrated into the discussion to substantiate the findings. • some claims appear broad or generalized without sufficient evidence. For instance: a. "People dealing with driving licenses expect the process to be clear, easy to understand, and straightforward." This needs evidence, such as survey data or cited studies, to avoid bias or assumption. b. "The public may still perceive other aspects of the service... affect their satisfaction more." This could be improved by pointing to specific evidence, such as survey responses or prior research. • include a subsection discussing the limitations of the findings. • expand on how the findings can be implemented in practice. (e.g., What specific training programs or technological improvements can enhance police competence? What changes can be made to service processes to increase public satisfaction?) • suggest areas for future research. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>I would say they are sufficient and recent.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript is understandable, but there are some minor language adjustments that would enhance its scholarly tone:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> some sections could be more concise, especially when interpreting tables. For example, the results for "Cronbach's Alpha" and "Composite Reliability" can be merged to avoid redundancy, as both discuss the reliability of variables. ensure that all figures and tables are referred to in the text. Phrases like "Figure 1" and "Table 1" should be clearly cited in the text where they are relevant (e.g., "As shown in Table 1..."). use consistent terminology for concepts like "public service quality," "police competence," and "community satisfaction" throughout the manuscript. In some instances, terms like "police apparatus competence" are used, which could be better framed as "police officer competence" for consistency. there are several instances where key ideas are repeated, which could be streamlined for better readability. For instance, the concept that the competence of police officers improves service quality and increases public satisfaction is reiterated multiple times. Condensing these repetitions would improve flow. some sentences are quite long and complex, which can make them difficult to follow. Breaking them up into shorter, simpler sentences might enhance readability and clarity. For example, the sentence, "When people feel that the service they receive is in line with their expectations, both in terms of speed, clarity of procedures, and officer attitude, they will tend to feel more satisfied," could be broken into two sentences for easier comprehension. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, the study makes a meaningful contribution to understanding public service delivery in the context of law enforcement and highlights avenues for improvement in public satisfaction through enhanced service quality. With minor revisions, the manuscript can achieve greater clarity, precision, and impact.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Adiyam Mulushoa Kebede</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia</p>