

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_82246
Title of the Manuscript:	THE ROLE OF EMOTIONAL FACTORS MEDIATES DISTRIBUTIVE, PROCEDURAL, AND INTERACTIONAL JUSTICE TO CONSUMER SATISFACTION IN RECIPIENTS OF THE SOCIAL SAFETY NET PROGRAM
Type of the 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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy> )

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>Although this paper to some extent contains good information adequate to justify publication, the author/s did not mention the core issue/problem statement, either references nor support or suggestions/recommendations to conduct this study!! It is recommended to straight and clarify the problem statement of this study</p> <p>The literature review section of this paper provides a review of the previous related materials on researches on <b>THE ROLE OF EMOTIONAL FACTORS MEDIATES DISTRIBUTIVE, PROCEDURAL, AND INTERACTIONAL JUSTICE TO CONSUMER SATISFACTION IN RECIPIENTS OF THE SOCIAL SAFETY NET PROGRAM</b>, the paper in somehow didn't put a clear link between the related variables of the study, the literature discussed briefly the Emotional Factors and Consumer Satisfaction, but never mention about relationship or influence of these factors. Therefore, more focus and consideration in this regard is needed, it is highly recommended to mention the gap in research in relations with the under study factors and variables.</p> <p>I suggest the author(s) allow the readers to engage with the literature, by showing other studies in similar studies that relate to THE ROLE OF EMOTIONAL FACTORS MEDIATES DISTRIBUTIVE, PROCEDURAL, AND INTERACTIONAL JUSTICE TO CONSUMER SATISFACTION IN RECIPIENTS OF THE SOCIAL SAFETY NET PROGRAM which make this paper distinct from those ones.</p> <p>What is the study population? In the case of this study, a sample was relied upon, isn't that just a little? Why was the qualitative approach not used and the appropriate data collection tools used for that?</p> <p>The study methodology need to improve as the author/s should explain more about the methods used in this study, the justification of using some analysis tools such as SEM analysis which clearly missing.</p> <p>Some minor issues grammar and spelling mistakes.</p> <p>Needs to add explanations about how the findings were obtained (how the author(s) gather the information from the data sources). That requires rewriting the methodology section.</p> <p>Should have more powerful relations between the findings and theoretical base. It is possible to state that the results are pragmatic and normative. There is a need to rewrite results in line with theoretical framework. Although paper provide insight, it has limited theoretic contribution. Therefore, originality of the paper is low relation between this conceptual framework and results is lack.</p> <p>This type of data collection period is difficult and requires a serious attention in qualitative methods. The reliability and validity of the method in the study is not satisfactory enough. Moreover, relation between the method used and the finding of the study is not sufficient enough. This problem bring up the reliability and validity problem again. Results aim for practitioners. Theoretical contribution is limited and insufficient</p> <p>Kindly, dub-check with the references guideline of the journal.</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Khairi Mohamed Omar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Applied Science University, Bahrain</b>