

Dear Dio Caisar Darma:

Your submission to SEISENSE Journal of Management, "Store Atmosphere, SERVQUAL and Consumer Loyalty: Is There a Relationship?" has been accepted with revisions for publication and hope to receive your revisions with two weeks.

Included below are the reviewer comments and we hope you find them useful in your revision.

When you submit your revised text, we would appreciate it if you could indicate in the accompanying email or other forms whether there are any suggestions you decided against adopting, especially if this means you have not made any corrections or revisions at the point in question. We can track minor changes using the track-changes function.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. Thank you for your submission to SEISENSE Journal of Management!

-----

Thanks

Dr. Syed Muhammad Azeem

Section Editor - Management

SEISENSE Journal of Management

Website: <https://journal.seisense.com/index.php/jom>

Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/seisensedotcom/>

Twitter: <https://twitter.com/SEISENSEDOTCOM>

---

Reviewer A:

Dear Editor in Chief

I thank you giving me this opportunity to review this manuscript.

Overall this paper is well written research but it seems like bit of descriptive in nature. I feel like the author have well written the literature review and also has undertaken fair data collection for the research and also the data has been analyzed in a proper scientific manner. This research is conducted in the city of Samarinda (Indonesia). From the paper it is evident that it's a case study of Excelso coffee shop. The main objective of this study is how consumer loyalty enhance through store atmosphere and SERVQUAL. The author of try to determine the linkage between those three variables.

Comments for "Introduction" Section

In writing the introduction of the research paper, normally we follow "the funnel approach" it seems like the author didn't follow that approach. In writing outstanding introduction for the research, the author needs to answer following questions:

What you are studying? (author has written about this)

Why was this topic important to investigate? (author didn't write well about this)

What did you know about this topic before you did this study? (author have discussed around the globe but local context didn't analyze)

Where the research gap and the problem? (have not answer this)

How will this study advance the knowledge? (have not answer this)

With reference to line 13-17, "With so many competitors in the business world, coffee makes businesses do shop development, create a better store atmosphere, and has its own characteristics from other coffee shops. The store atmosphere is the differentiator of the coffee shop from one another. That in itself is very influential in getting and attracting consumers. In addition, service quality is also very influential in the development of a business" how do you know this? You require to give proper intext reference for those point then your argument will be valid.

With reference to line 22-24, "The store atmosphere is divided into six elements, i.e. lighting, music, temperature, aroma, spatial planning, and building design. Store atmosphere can affect the enjoyment of people spending time at the café or restaurant. Customer loyalty is something that is always expected by every business person." how do you know this? You require to give proper intext reference for those point then your argument will be valid.

With reference to line 31-33, how do you know that Service quality (SERVQUAL) of five dimensions developed by Parasuraman et al., 1988, can be useful for local context of Indonesia? Why do you used this old SERVQUAL dimension? Don't you think its outdated? Don't you find in the academia any updated SERVQUAL dimension model for coffee shop? Do you think this is appropriate for your study? If so justify?

Clearly indicate the problem and the research gap.

Overall the introduction requires little bit modification in making the write up. As stated earlier try to use "funnel approach" in writing introduction.

Comments for "Literature Review" (LR) Section

It seems like only one side of the coin the author have discussed in the LR, due to that it can't be considered as critical review of literature. It is recommended the author to be more critical in writing the LR.

The in-text reference always given in the end of the paragraph, rather give the reference for the sentences or bunch of sentences together, so that it can have more professional academic look.

The hypothesis developed look good.

Comments for "Scale of Measurement" Section

Recommended to rename "scale of measurement" as "methodology", because I believe this is the methodology section of this research paper.

Indicate the type of this research (Qualitative or Quantitative or Mixed) method and justify.

The author didn't indicate which software is used in analyzing the data, therefore it is recommended to indicate the software used in analyzing the data for the research paper.

With reference to line 114, the author stated the sampling method used in the research is "purposive sampling", the justification of that should be included in the paper, which the author failed to indicate.

With reference to line 118-120, author stated that "based on the hypothesis, n x 5 observed variables (indicators) to n x 10 observed variables (indicators). There are 14 items used in the question to measure variables, so the number of respondents used was 98 participants." Explain this? This is not very clear.

For the purpose of this research did you use adapted set of questionnaire form or you have developed your own set of questionnaire form, based on the previous LR. If you have developed your own set of questionnaire form have you pilot test the questionnaire form before actual data collection.

The total 98 collected is it 100% usable for data analysis.

Can the data collected via online and social media be reliable? Justify.

Comments for "Results" Section

The results section the author has explained very well.

With reference to line 165-166, author stated that "significance level of 10%, indicator 4 of the SERVQUAL." Do you want to indicate it as 10% or 1%, check whether it's an error or not?

Comments for "Discussion" Section

With reference to line 214-215, author stated that "the quality is less systematic impact, because the acquisition is not significant." What do you mean by the "quality" in here and what do you try to tell in this sentence?

The 2nd hypothesis is rejected, and this finding is inconsistent with other researchers in the academia. Indicate what might be the reason for this inconsistent result for your study.

Overall the discussion part well discussed.

Comments for "Conclusion" Section

This part is well documented.

Include the managerial and practical implications of the paper.

Overall Comments for the paper

Include the limitation of the study.

This research is a case study of "Excelso coffee shop", so I highly recommend to make that visible from the title of the research paper.

This paper can be accepted with minor revision.

It was great pleasure to read this manuscript. I wish the author all the best.

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

-----

Reviewer B:

use updated references

Recommendation: Accept Submission