



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_50335
Title of the Manuscript:	PERCEPTION OF QUALITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN ETHIOPIA: A CASE STUDY OF DIRE DAWA UNIVERSITY
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=sd-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>Title</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Relevant but adjusted to make it more meaningful as indicated in the manuscript <p>Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Correct the errors indicated in the manuscript.. <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Correct the grammar errors and sentence structures. ❖ Provide the in-text citation for the first and second paragraphs to make this information authentic. ❖ Lacks coherency. ❖ Correct the highlighted mistakes in the manuscript. <p>General Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Correct the mistakes highlighted. ❖ Use past tense as this is not a proposal but is a research which has already been conducted. ❖ State the research questions smartly and let them come immediately after the objectives. ❖ Decide whether to use research questions or hypotheses but not both. ❖ The research questions or hypothesis should be derived from specific objectives. <p>Literature Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Correct the mistakes highlighted in the manuscript. ❖ Leading words should begin with capital letters. <p>Methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Correct the mistakes highlighted. ❖ Briefly describe the research design. ❖ Questionnaire cannot gather secondary data. ❖ Describe the sampling technique. ❖ This section lacks coherency. <p>Data Collection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Explain the mixed method approach implied in this section. ❖ If hypotheses have to be employed, they should be clearly stated (Both null & alternative). <p>Data Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Fair <p>Demographic Data of Respondents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Correct the mistakes indicated in the manuscript 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Create the total raw in Table 2 as shown in the manuscript. ❖ However, a good attempt was made in this particular section. <p>Results and Discussions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Correct the mistakes highlighted. ❖ Lacks coherency. <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Make the conclusion concise and precise base on the findings of each objective/research question/hypothesis. <p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Make precise recommendations. <p>Reference</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Authors should be listed alphabetically 	
Minor REVISION comments	-Consider to reduce the objectives/research questions/hypotheses of this study to 3	
Optional/General comments	N/A	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Joseph O. Mukolwe
Department, University & Country	Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science & Technology, Kenya