



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEMT_51159</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Service Quality and Customer Satisfaction on Budget Airlines: Kano model approach</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><i>It is a must to proofread the entire write-up. There are many obvious errors in grammar (e.g. led not leaded for the past tense of lead; staff not staffs; missing articles; wrong use of punctuation) and sentence structure (e.g. line 11- 14).</i></p> <p><i>As there are already few researches on this topic (service quality, airline services and Kano model), I don't see the uniqueness and hence, theoretical contribution of this study.</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, the discussion on the implications for the practitioners should be expanded. At present, in this section, author just recapped the key findings with a brief statement without insightful discussions how the key findings can be used to provide implications to the practitioners. It is also suggested to include a discussion on the implications for the body of the knowledge, too.</i></p> <p><i>As the "Questionable" attribute was included in the analysis (section 4.2), why there was no discussion on it (section 4.3). The author justification on the exclusion of this attribute in Section 2.4 was weak.</i></p>	<p>Thanks.</p> <p>The whole manuscript has been checked and the writing is improved,</p> <p>Kano model is widely applied and especially in service quality provided by airlines but not many in budgeted airlines. Descriptions about the significance of this study is added to Introduction.</p> <p>Actually the discussion part has been integrated into the data analysis. The authors agree with the point that more practical discussion are needed. They are added to the part in the part Kao model analysis and Conclusion.</p> <p>The addition of questions about Questionable in questionnaire was just for 'control' purpose as the descriptions have mentioned that Questionable attribute did not concern in this study. The result in Table 6 also shows that Q is not significant. The authors agree that descriptions should be added even though it is not concerned. So a short description about Q is added.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p><i>Was the same questionnaire used for the face-to-face survey and online platform? If yes, how did you ensure to reduce the variances and hence biases in the data collection procedures? No explanation on this matter.</i></p>	<p>Yes, same questionnaires were used for two groups of respondents. Variances in these two groups of collected will be catered in another research and this research focuses on the findings of using the Kano model.</p>

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	