



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_26494
Title of the Manuscript:	Examining Customer Satisfaction and Switch Intentions in the Banking Industry, Ghana: A critical study of the Ghana Commercial Bank Experience
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>)



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	- Line (285) the authors mentioned that the distributed and collected questionnaires were (200) but on the table1 the no# of respondents (male + female= 230) is not matched to what earlier mentioned. - The switching intention construct is not appearing in the proposed conceptual framework - What are the limitations and suggestion for further research? - Authors need to include theoretical contribution in the conclusions - Please, explain in detail how authors got the sample, which criterion they followed, etc. - Please, be more concise in the conclusions. They are not very clear.	Please Agreed. Male respondents is 114. 144 in table 1 was typo error. Corrected in revised version. (Males 114 + 86 Females = 200) Pls. Agreed. Switch Int. added to conceptual framework Fig.1 Pls. Limitations and suggestion for studies added Pls agree. Conclusion revised as suggested and theoretical contribution included in revised vers. Pls. Agreed. Procedure explained in revised vers. Pls. Conclusion concisely revised for clarity.
Minor REVISION comments	- Line (3) plural (banks) - Line (12) brand image NOT brand satisfaction. - Line (33) confusing (long sentence). - Line (39-40) not clear - Line (75- 83) Support your argument with some reference related to the problem statement. - Line (35-38) Please, be more concise. They are not very clear. - Line (54) add abbreviation to customer satisfaction - Line (58) not clear, please support your argument with some recent citation - Line (61) as the first time was mentioned the abbreviation no need to repeat it again. - Line (74) explain what GCB'S is.	Pls. no: Ghana commercial bank is one specific bank in Ghana with branches across the country. Pls. Agree is 'brand image'. Corrected in revised vers. Pls. Agree. Sentence have been revised accordingly Pls. Sentence revised accordingly Pls. I agree. revised version supported with reference related to problem statement Pls. Agree. Have been revised. Pls. I Agree. (CS) added in revised version Pls. Agree. Revised and supported with recent citation Agreed. (SQ), (CS), (CS) deleted accordingly Pls agree. GCB's has been explained in revsd ver.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- Please show the readers the directions of the proposed hypotheses on the proposed conceptual framework. - Please mention how many items used to measure each construct. - Line (88) not clear - Line (60; 151; 192; 211; 238) the reference is not mentioned in the references list. - Line (495; 476; 515; 460; 474; 505) the reference is not completed - line (458; 500; 510; 461; 465; 528; 482; 478; 498; 522; 498; 522) please refer to the reference style.	Agreed. Done pls. SQ=5; PP=5 & BIM=3 Pls. Agreed. Revised for clarity Agreed. Pls done Pls. done Well noted
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	- Line (24) an appropriate arrangement of keywords will ensure accurate indexing and help display the research paper to interested groups. This in turn, will strengthen the opportunity of paper for being cited. (Service Quality, Price Perception, Brand Image, Customer Satisfaction, Switch Intentions, Ghana, Commercial Banks). - Line (58) superior level of satisfaction rather than best - Line (106) recommended adding “constructs development” to literature review title to become (literature review and constructs development). - Part 2.1 line (233) it is recommended to add “proposed” as you proposed a relationship among the variables. - Line(107-112); (164-177); (204-211)very long sentences - In the section (3) I suggest to include a table where readers can see the measured items and its value (Cronbach α for each construct and the mean, std ...etc). - Please update the manuscript with recent references. - Many abbreviations are not mentioned. - Please make mentions if any screening tests were carried out - There is no table that shows the relationship between switching intention and customer’s satisfaction. - Line (356-360) redundant	Pls. Agree. Done as suggested in revised version, however, Ghana Commercial Bank as a one specific bank in Ghana is the case study; not all Commercial Banks in Ghana. Therefore, instead of Ghana, Commercial, we suggest Ghana Commercial Bank. Pls. Agree. Done in revised version Agree done please Pls agreed. Has been done accordingly Pls. Well noted. The needed corrections have been done. Ple well noted. Done, see Table 1. pls, Apha for the 18 items = 0.704 and not 0.730 as in the original script. Typo error occurred. We have tried our best to add one or two other recent references. Agree others have been added, pls. Pls. Well noted, few identified mentioned now. No please. No screening test was carried out Pls well noted. Table 7 presents the relationship in the revised version Well noted pls. Deleted accordingly
--	--	--