



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_10516
Title of the Manuscript:	An Evaluation of Service Quality of Mobily and STC Telecommunication Companies in Saudi Arabia
Type of the Article	Review 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>)



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	-Not Indicate the limitation of the study and the significance of the study in introduction of the paper but in the conclusion (3. Limitation of the study, 4.significance of the study) Problem and objectives of research can be developed in the introduction -Indicate the mode of administration of the questionnaire -Table 1: Representation of the Ranges of Means. Explains how you have calculated the value of means of Likert scale??? The author's represented five categories of likert scale by value of means (what is the findings of this method or the references: it must be justify in order to have scientifically robustness) -in table 3, author indicates item, there is one item by dimension???? , verify if this is a presentation of item The authors indicate that ; "The study will use the dimensions of quality only and not pursue the model itself. The reason for that is to make the study as simple as possible", but the method of evaluation of dimensions is not clear and must to be justified	-I moved both limitations and significance of the study at the end. (I agree with the reviewer on this point, since those two elements are usually come to the attention of the reader of the article and have to be answered at the end. Problem and objectives are developed into the introduction part of the study: This is really much better since mentioning the problems and objectives in separate headings may distract readers and is more of classic way. -Mode of the administration of the questionnaire has been indicated and highlighted. Sometimes, we miss mentioning information because we think others know them. But really, good thing to indicate. -In table 3, verification has been included and highlighted under section 4.2 Levels of Service Well, my opinion is that it is now better, and the reviewer has the right to be confident about the process. -In Section 1. Introduction, this clarification has been made.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Revised the recommendations , the case of recommendation (a) : Saudi government may sell its remaining 70% ownership shares to the public.???	This recommendation has been revised. I would assume that the revision is clear
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Revised the text and use “and “and not “et”	