



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_22239
Title of the Manuscript:	An assessment of effectiveness of marketing mix as a satisfaction tool at local authorities in Ghana
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:

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



SDI 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The main problem with this paper is that the methodology section is so poorly written with so few details that it is difficult to take the results seriously. There are more details in the abstract about research design than in the methodology section. The sample selection process is unclear and so is the sample size. The initial sample seems to be of 25 respondents yet calculations have been made, including standard deviations, which are inappropriate for such a small sample size. The literature review section is deficient. The author should use this section to highlight gaps in knowledge which could be filled by the current research. These gaps should then be stated as hypotheses that could then be tested in the analysis sections. There is no adequate discussion section wherein the author could discuss the results of hypothesis testing and the theoretical implications of this. The findings section is too long – there is no need for so many long and uninformative tables. The author should find some way to summarise this section effectively.	All suggested changes have been done
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		