



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_46661
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Library Service Quality on Students' Satisfaction in Higher Educational Environments: The Case of Wollo University
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	<p>1. There should be clear correspondence among the objectives of the study, the methodology, the results and discussion, and the conclusion. In the methodology, there is no need to mention the "demographic profiles" as part of data gathering since this was not part of the stated objectives and no result was presented regarding this. Moreover, the first part of the Conclusion section (re: gap differences between desired expectation and perceptions of actual service) was also inappropriate for inclusion since no results regarding these were presented in Results and Discussion section and even the statement of objectives was not clear on this. Revise the said parts of the paper accordingly.</p> <p>2. The overall organization of the paper was good enough but there are sentences and paragraphs that should be improved. An English expert on the construction of sentences and paragraphs and on the use of more appropriate words should be consulted. Special attention should be given on the Abstract and the Methodology.</p>	Very critical and valuable comments
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. In the Abstract, the statement "12 questionnaires were not returned" should not be part of the "Results". It may simply be mentioned in the Methodology section (in the text, not anymore in the Abstract) that 12 out of 366 copies of questionnaires distributed were not returned, resulting to 354 actual respondents out of the 366 targeted sample size.</p> <p>2. In the Keywords, "higher education" or "higher educational institution" is more appropriate than "higher institution".</p> <p>3. There are incorrect/incomplete entries in the References section. Please review the journal's guidelines on making the list of references.</p> <p>4. Note also that Reference 12 and 13 are exactly the same. Delete Reference 13 and change the citation '(13)' in page 3 by "[12]". Also change the citation "(12)" in page 2 by "[12]".</p>	Yes valuable comments
Optional/General comments		



PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No ethical issues comments are based on only sciences.