



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_44493
Title of the Manuscript:	Service Quality and Customer Satisfaction of Electricity Distribution Company: A Study of Olumo Business Hub, Abeokuta, Ogun State.
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	1. Structural Equation Model does not display the goodness of fit indices 2. Table 3 and Table 4: CUS1, CUS2 etc. are not clarified 3. The factor constructs of SERVQUAL were not displayed 4. Table 4 is a result of what kind of analysis? EFA or CFA? 5. Line number 388 and 389 talks about discriminant validity. But its explanation and tests were not conducted. CFA can only determine discriminant validity 6. In line number 396 AVE has been mentioned. But one could not find the Average Variance Extracted values 7. It is not clear from the study whether any pilot test has been conducted to identify scale items and refine survey instruments	1. No goodness of fit in the research article 2. CUS 1, CUS2 show the construct for Customer satisfaction 3. The SERVQUAL model were displayed; the reviewer should look at table 4 and see how SERVQUAL model were display 4. Table 4 display CFA 5. The table 6 have demonstrated the discriminant validity 6. Table 7 display AVE 7. Pilot student was conducted and we have include that in the body of the work.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The study did not identify any research gap where it can actually contribute to enrich the existing body of knowledge.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	
If plagiarism is suspected, <u>please provide related proofs or web links.</u>	Plagiarism detected (35%).	