



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_26071
Title of the Manuscript:	SERVICE QUALITY, PRICE AND STUDENT SATISFACTION IN MODIBBO ADAMA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, YOLA. ADAMAWA STATE NIGERIA
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	The conclusion of my review is: 1. The main deficiency of the paper is the primary data. The authors distributed only 250 questionnaires, and they have only 215 respondents. Having in mind that MODIBBO ADAMA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY has more that 20.000 students, in seven schools, I consider that the study is irrelevant for the overall student satisfaction in that particular university. 2. In the less restrictive conditions, in order o have a confidence level of 95% and a margin of error of 5%, the study requires at least a number of 377 respondents. With a margin of error of 3%, the number of respondents increases to more than 1000. If a higher confidence is expected (99%), the number of respondents is minimum 643 (with a 5% margin of error). 3. The paper suffers also by the lack of explanation of methodology. The authors don't present the items of the questionnaire. In the case of the SERVQUAL items one can figure what the items were, but I consider that the presentation of supplementary items introduced in order to asses the influence of price on student satisfaction was mandatory. 4. The results are poorly discussed (Table 2, 3, 5, 6) 5. There are many other flaws: • row 23: Ginsberg, 1991 - doesn't appear in the references section • row 63, 70, and 73: Ajayi & Ekundayo, 2008 - doesn't appear in the references section • row 151: Lehtinen and Lehtinen, 1991 - doesn't appear in the references section • row 244: what is alpha, why appear beta 7?	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• row 265: “cronbachs value”, instead of Cronbach’s alpha value; here is debatable also the fact that 0.7 value indicates a high level of reliability, that is more an acceptable reliability • rows 274-280: poor discussion and editing inconsistency (TG, AS is missing, RE and RP are noted as Re and Rp) In my opinion the paper can be reconsidered if the authors adopts one of the following strategies: • if the data were obtain in a specific department of university or group of students of the university (for example “first year students in engineering”), the authors can use the primary data from this study, but they have to reconsider their objective; they can not conclude on overall student satisfaction in entire university; • to administrate again the questionnaire to a higher number of students (they can have in mind a school, or hole university) and to redone the study.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gabriela Strnad
Department, University & Country	Department of Industrial Engineering and Management, University of Tirgu Mures, Romania