SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEBA_55309**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A MULTIPLE CRITERIA ANALYSIS OF CUSTOMERS SATISFACTION OF DISTANCE EDUCATION IN GHANA: EVIDENCE FROM BOLGATANGA CENTRE OF UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST.**
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	• It should be emphasised (summarised) the scientific contributions of the manuscript and research performed in the section of Conclusion. • In the effort to slightly help authors when improving the scientific level of their study, it can be only recommended to incorporate "the fresher" literate sources into the body of manuscript (because of the presented version contains the works published to 2016, but not works published in 2017 – 2019, 2020 respectively).	• Please, the authors agreed with your suggestion to summarise the conclusion. This has therefore been revised in yellow for easy tracking. • Current literature has been cited in the text to reflect the reviewer's comment.
Minor REVISION comments	• There occur small grammar or formal imperfections in the manuscript, e.g. double spaces, redundant spaces (e.g. "co- coordinators"), small letter at the sentence beginning, e.g. "… centre. *those*" (p. 9), etc. Also, a mistakes are in these parts: "… customer *';lrelationship* management" (p. 3); "… be put in p[place" (p. 10). • It could be suggested to use "identical" graphical visage (used colours and types of graphs) of all Figures (the mixture of various graphics does not increase the "scientific" level of the manuscript). • Perhaps, in the following sentence, the *Table 2* should be mentioned (not Table 1): "It was however noticed that there were no significant differences ($p < 0.05$) between students who responded that the furniture in the classroom was good and those who said the furniture was very good (Table 1)" (p. 7).	• Please, the errors stated have been revised according to your suggestions. • This point is well noted and would be applied in subsequent figures. A mixture was employed here due to the different variables and to enhance the beauty of the work. • In Page 7, the author have revised "Table 1" to "Table 2"
Optional/General comments	Separate sections 4.0 and 5.0 should be better connected in one section.	• Section 4.0 and 5.0 has been combined as suggested.

SDI Review Form 1.6

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)*	