

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

Bình Nghiêm-Phú¹

¹ University of Hyogo

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Authors,

Thank you for writing this paper. I want to share with you some of my observations as a reader about your work.

1. Language and format

- The language quality is poor. Please use a professional editing service to help you improve the language before submitting any papers.
- The list of references is minimal. Please read more research related to staff commitment, customer satisfaction, and banking services in Africa. Please consistently follow one referencing style.
- The statements lack references to support them. Please cite prior research to back your arguments.

2. Introduction

- Overall, this section must provide a background for the research, the gaps in the literature to justify the research, the purpose of the research, and the potential contributions of the research. The current version does not meet the criteria.
- Subsection 1.2. should not be placed here.
- Subsection 2.5. should be placed here.

Recommendation: Please review the literature to verify the gaps concerning staff commitment, customer satisfaction, and African banks. Please clearly mention these gaps to show the essentiality of your research.

3. Literature review

- Overall, this section must provide the conceptual background and framework for the research. The variables must be conceptualized, the associations between the variables must be defined and discussed, and the impacting factors must be identified. The current version does not meet the criteria.
- Most importantly, the authors examine two groups of variables belonging to two groups of subjects: (1) commitments involve the staff, and (1) satisfaction involves the customers. You cannot measure these two phenomena from only one perspective. The theoretical framework and the outcomes are invalid. In addition, a theoretical model with three

independent variables and one dependent variable is too simplistic. It is difficult or impossible to publish such research in the 2020s.

Recommendation: Please define each variable to see what it is, how it is measured, and how it is connected to other variables. Please identify what you can do differently or better.

4. Method

- Method and methodology have different meanings. With an empirical paper, “method” is more appropriate.
- Overall, this section must provide information about the instrument, the sampling method, the survey procedure or the data collection process, and the analysis of the data. The current version does not meet the criteria.
- Without information about the measures, the readers cannot evaluate the validity and reliability of the instrument or questionnaire.
- Without information about the sampling method, the readers cannot evaluate the authenticity and validity of the data. The sampling method seemed to be nonprobability. Allocating 30 participants for one bank, regardless of its characteristics, was unreliable.
- Without information about the survey procedure, the readers cannot evaluate the authenticity and validity of the data.
- The authors did not understand the analysis process. Presenting a formula does not help show or improve the sophistication of the paper. Calculating Cronbach’s alpha for all measures is totally inappropriate.

Recommendation: Please study more about research design and data analysis.

5. Results

- Overall, the results are invalid and unreliable, given the problems in research design and data collection.
- Please ensure that the language is correct, especially the technical terms.
- Please explain the meanings of the asterisks in all tables.
- Please learn how to interpret and present the data. What is shown in Tables 4-6 is mostly inappropriate and incomprehensible.

6. Discussion

- Overall, this section must discuss how the research has achieved its purposes, the what and how of the outcomes, the similarities or differences with the prior research, the position of this research in the existing literature, and some theoretical and practical implications. The current version does not meet the criteria.

Recommendation: Please revise the purpose, design, and method to develop better research.



Finally, I wish the authors the best with your efforts.

Best regards.