

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_84077
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF CUSTOMER SATISFACTION ON THE PROFITABILITY OF THE SACCO SECTOR IN KENYA. A CASE OF THAMANI SACCO SOCIETY LIMITED THARAKA NITHI COUNTY
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	major revision	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>Comments to the Author and Editor</p> <p>Firstly, many thanks for giving me the chance to review this paper.</p> <p>This study discussed the EFFECT OF CUSTOMER SATISFACTION ON THE PROFITABILITY OF THE SACCO SECTOR IN KENYA. However, the manuscript, in its present form, contains several weaknesses. Appropriate revisions to the following points should be undertaken in order to justify recommendation for publication. For readers to quickly catch your contribution, it would be better to highlight major difficulties and challenges, and your original achievements to overcome them. My major concerns are as follows:</p> <p>The topic is important and interesting.</p> <p>In the Abstract, generally speaking, its structure is made up of “background, purpose, method, result, conclusion, and value section”. However, it needs to supply “method and value sections”, meanwhile also supply “background section”, and the authors also control the number of words and not more than 220 in all, and 254 words at present.</p> <p>In the Keywords, it is not good but the authors could choose key and the correct keywords should be “customer satisfaction; Profitability; Saccos; census study; Descriptive research design” .</p> <p>In the Introduction, the materials of the paper shown should be just up-date to 2022, and the authors also can look through the recent and important paper on this topic “EFFECT OF CUSTOMER SATISFACTION ON THE PROFITABILITY OF THE SACCO SECTOR IN KENYA” again, specially during the year of 2019-2022. Are the authors sure that the research question is clearly outlined?</p> <p>In the Literature review and research Hypotheses, we should link to the recent and most literature about “Customer Satisfaction”, specially 2019-2022. Besides, we also pay more attention to the value and contribution of the paper. However, the manuscript lacks the literature review section. And the authors should add it, use literature to develop the arguments. The literature should be updated, I suggest that. No any interviews are conducted and authors directly jump towards identifying key attributes.</p> <p>According to me, in the research framework, the authors will be looking for other valuable models. Figure of The framework should be simplified.</p> <p>In the Methodology section, the authors should describe more details about how to investigate.</p> <p>In the Questionnaire design, the authors should introduce and illustrate more about the</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>measures.</p> <p>In the Discussion section, the authors should explain results, derive specific theoretical, practical implications, and describe limitations.</p> <p>In the Conclusion and recommendations section, the paper should make a theoretical or practical or methodological contribution. They should be separated into two parts, I suggest that.</p> <p>In the References section, we should strictly conduct as APA style. And their DOIs should be added. Besides, it is lack of the recent and important ones, specially the year of 2019-2022.</p> <p>Based on the contribution and value of the Manuscript, I must choose major revision.</p>	
--	--	--

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:	Bei Lyu
Department, University & Country	HuaiBei Normal University, China