



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_33021
Title of the Manuscript:	Measuring Tabuk Municipal Services Quality
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	1. It is very well understood from reviewing the manuscript that the author/s were not meticulous while putting the paper together. The paper is far below the standards. The paper needs a careful proof-reading as there are many typos and grammatical errors (.....evaluatesservice... Tayler (1992) or Taylor,.... public.Moreover,... aCrobach's... and many others.) 2. In the text and in Table 2 the authors give 2 different Cronbach's Alphas which are 91 and 94. Which one is correct? 3. The paper is not comprehensive in terms of explaining the methodology. Details on the sampling frame, the method of applying the questionnaires, etc. should be explained in detail. 4. The author/s employed an interview process. What did you do to establish reliability and validity? No details on the interview process. 5. In discussion and conclusion part, you discuss your findings with other researchers, and then explain the limitations. Here, give some significant findings and comment on them. Examine your findings. Develop some suggestions for practitioners and academics. 6. References part of the paper should also be reexamined.	Done Please notice, this comment does not exist at the version that we sent first time, which i means if you compare the version that you sent by email to us with the uploaded version at your web site (author centre). The Cronbach's Alphas is 91 in our study whereas the reliability of the responses is 94 which explained in table 2 (in table 5 in this version) Done Done Done Done
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		