

Review of: "Two New Gaps for SERVQUAL"

Edina Molnár¹

¹ University of Debrecen

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

REVIEW SUMMARY FOR TWO NEW GAPS FOR SERVQUAL MODEL BY: Victor Tang & Gendao Li

The topic of this article is very interesting, and its outcome will greatly help improve the existing SERVQUAL model. The authors provided a good summary.

However,

- The article looks more like a proposal than the outcome of a scientific study.
- The authors have provided no hypothesis to try and falsify the existing model.
- The proposed gaps lack sufficient literature review support from previous studies challenging the SERVQUAL model.
- Challenging an existing theory or proposing amendments requires sufficient conflicting data that have been accumulated through a series of scientific studies and that then justify the existence of the new gaps proposed. These are missing in the article.
- Authors are advised to adhere to a proper scientific writing format such as problem statement, sufficient literature review, hypothesis, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion to meet the expected scientific rigor.
- Authors are advised to update references with more recent studies; the provided references from 1984 to 2014 are rather old.

In summary, scientific theories/models develop and change over time through a dynamic process of observation, hypothesis testing, experimentation, peer review, validation, and refinement. This iterative process allows researchers to build on existing knowledge, challenge established ideas, and create new or improved theories that can address emerging issues.