



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It should be emphasised (summarised) the scientific contributions of the manuscript and research performed in the section of Conclusion.</li> <li>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).</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 ;irelationship management" (p. 3); "... be put in p[place]" (p. 10).</li> <li>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).</li> <li>Perhaps, in the following sentence, the <i>Table 2</i> should be mentioned (not Table 1): "It was however noticed that there were no significant differences (<math>p &lt; 0.05</math>) 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).</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Separate sections 4.0 and 5.0 should be better connected in one section.	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Martina Blašková</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>University of Žilina, Slovak</i></b>