

# Review of: "Effect of Employees' Commitment on Customer Satisfaction of Banks in Africa"

Vaibhav Bhamoriya<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Indian Institute of Management Kashipur

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

This is a very interesting and valiant effort at conducting the study and completing the research piece and putting it together. It is a good start but lacks to make the cut of international quality publications.

The authors are advised to clearly focus and use a single term. Either employee commitment or staff commitment or explain the difference between the two. Use of two different terms which are meant to talk of the same thing may leave the readers confused.

The study currently reports very intuitive findings which are very run of the mill and hardly any justification of why this research is novel has been provided in the manuscript.

The second sentence of the introduction is stating the findings ;leaving the reviewer confused if it is findings or is it the introduction. If it is the introduction there is no contribution of this research and if they are findings how can they be the opening introduction.

The study currently exhibits a lot of problems with the quality of English language used in the paper such as in this sentence "Employee commitment to customer satisfaction has a significant effect on a company's success."

There are counter logics possible requiring a better explanation of the variables used and why? an example could be , If staff is passionate about quality customer service delivery, they will provide high quality service, build strong relationships with customers, and be creative and innovative in their approach to problem solving. This can lead to increased customer loyalty, higher retention rates, more referrals, and increased sales.

The authors miss the mention of banks in the introduction or even banking in Africa opening the much larger and deeper question as to why this sample ? It is very Interesting that the hypothesis come before the lit review. This can happen only when they are researched upon following an exploration study. The Title of sub section within 2.3 uses a word Deamination .. which doesn't seem in place. Definitions used here have not been ascribed to either literature or the authors own conceptualization.

Section 3 methodology is very very weak and needs significant overhauling to make it robust and readable from a research document point of view. There is hardly any description of the econometric model whatsoever and there is no mention about the coefficients in the model. This is surely shoddy work. It should read cronbach's alpha value and not cornbrash's alpha value.. it is likely that the manuscript is generated using a speech to text software or even a bad-quality

AI generator and hence should be corrected before submission.

Section 4 on results does not match up very well with section 5 on methodology and the reader gets very little idea why a particular methodology and tests were chosen and what the results convey in the context of the issue being studied about banks. This section needs a serious upgrade for publication.

Section 5 discusses only the regression results and that too in a very mechanistic way. While the link of affective commitment and customer satisfaction is mentioned there is sudden talk of other variables which is neither coming from literature as there are no references to it nor is it following from the analysis done in the study.

Hypothesis H2 is not very well enunciated in terms of the regression results. The hypothesis was not rejected .. is this the hypothesis or the null hypothesis? statistically, there is a difference between not rejected and accepted. . this seems to be the base of the communication error being mentioned here.

The conclusions section or the section before that does not add up the hypothesis together and give an emerging larger picture. And therefore, a large part of the conclusion is not clearly understood.