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| PART 1: Comments |
|  | Reviewer’s comment**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | **This manuscript addresses the adaptation of the SERVQUAL framework into a digital “e-Qual” tool tailored for higher education institutions, focusing on quality service assessment across administrative and academic offices. As higher education increasingly integrates digital tools into quality assurance, the availability of a context-sensitive, validated instrument is timely and relevant. The chapter’s emphasis on practical application in institutional offices adds value for administrators seeking systematic service evaluation. While the work offers useful preliminary findings, its full potential will be realised with stronger psychometric evidence to support the tool’s validity.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The current title is clear and descriptive. A slightly refined alternative could be:“Mapping Stakeholder Perceptions of Service Quality: Development and Initial Validation of the e-Qual Assessment Tool in Higher Education Institutions.”This emphasizes the specific tool name.**  |  |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | **The abstract clearly outlines the study’s purpose and general findings but could be strengthened by:*** **Including the sample size (N = 105) and participant groups (students, faculty, staff, office heads).**
* **Stating the validation procedures used (expert review, pretest) and noting that future work should add factor analysis and reliability testing.**
* **Removing the duplicated term “Reliability” and tightening phrasing for clarity.**
 |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.**  | **The conceptual framework and instrument adaptation process are appropriate. However, the claim of full “validation” is overstated as the analysis relies mainly on weighted means and rankings without standard psychometric testing. To establish construct validity, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) or confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) should be conducted, along with internal consistency measures such as Cronbach’s alpha. The sample size is at the lower threshold for such testing, and this limitation should be acknowledged.** |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | **The references include foundational SERVQUAL literature and some regional studies but would benefit from incorporating more recent (2020–2024) research on:*** **Digital service quality in higher education**
* **SERVQUAL adaptations in institutional contexts**
* **Psychometric methods for instrument validationIncluding methodological sources would also strengthen the Methods section.**
 |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | **Overall, the manuscript is readable, but it would benefit from professional copyediting. Minor grammatical errors, word repetition, and some lengthy sentences affect clarity. Improving sentence flow, especially in the Abstract and Methods, will enhance scholarly presentation.** |  |
| Optional/General comments | **The chapter has strong applied relevance and a clear practical purpose for institutional quality assurance. Including the full instrument in an appendix, adding more rigorous validation statistics, and clarifying the scope of “validation” would greatly enhance its contribution.** |  |
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| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?**  | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)*. |  |
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