



Peer Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Client Satisfaction with Service Delivery in the Philippine Government Infrastructure Agency: A SERVPERF-Based Assessment of the DPWH Camiguin District Engineering Office
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

General Comments and Recommendations

The reviewers acknowledge the significance of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further improve its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall scholarly quality. In addition, you are advised to thoroughly review and validate all references included in the manuscript. Please ensure that all cited sources are accurate, accessible, and retrievable through Google Scholar to uphold the credibility and reliability of the study. Additionally, make sure to include the DOI or website link for every reference whenever available to facilitate verification and accessibility of sources. Furthermore, only sources that are cited within the manuscript should appear in the References section, and all entries listed in the References section must also be cited in the text. For example, if 20 unique sources are cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should be included in the References section. Please also note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Please also make sure to check the references properly. For example:
ResearchGate. (2026). Service quality and client satisfaction in public sector: An empirical assessment of the Philippine Social Security System. (Preprint). <https://www.researchgate.net/>
In this reference, ResearchGate should not be treated as the author of the article. Please identify and provide the correct author/s of the study, since ResearchGate is only the platform where the article was uploaded or accessed. Kindly ensure that all references follow the correct APA 7th edition format, with accurate authors, year, title, source, and working DOI or URL when available.

Reviewer 1

General Comments and Recommendations

The paper has a useful and practical topic, especially because client satisfaction in a government infrastructure agency is not always studied in a very focused way. The use of SERVPERF is also appropriate because the study looks at actual service performance. Overall, the paper can contribute to public sector service quality improvement.



Specific Comments and Recommendations

The study used total enumeration, but only 59 respondents were included from clients with transactions from 2017 up to the present. This is a long period, so the authors should explain how the list of respondents was generated, how “active transactions” were defined, and whether all eligible clients were really reached or only those available. Also, the paper said that the questionnaire was expert validated and pilot tested, with Cronbach’s alpha of 0.85, but the actual number of items per SERVPERF dimension, sample items, validation rating, and pilot sample size are not clearly shown. Without these details, it is difficult to judge if the instrument truly measured satisfaction and service delivery problems in the DPWH context. The statistical tests also need more support. The paper mentioned that assumptions for parametric tests were met, but there is no evidence shown for normality, homogeneity of variance, or suitability of ANOVA given the small group sizes. Because the conclusions are strong, such as saying that service is equitable across demographic groups and that females perceive problems more seriously, the authors should present the methodological basis more transparently.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
☐	Accept the manuscript for publication.
☐	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers’ comments and recommendations.
☐	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

Reviewer 2

General Comments and Recommendations

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. I commend the authors for putting together this study. Assessing client satisfaction in government infrastructure agencies is highly relevant, especially in monitoring Quality Management Systems (QMS) and ensuring continuous quality improvement in public service. The paper is well-organized and the intention to help DPWH Camiguin improve its services is very clear.

Specific Comments and Recommendations

The study used a total enumeration of 59 respondents. While this might be acceptable for a local office survey, N=59 is a very small sample size to confidently run inferential statistics like ANOVA. When you break down this sample into multi-categorical variables, the sub-groups become too small to yield statistically robust results. For instance, in your Years of Engagement demographic, the “6-10 years” group only has 12 respondents. You stated that the data was compliant with the assumptions of using parametric tests. However, with a sample this small, especially using ordinal Likert scale data, did you run a normality test (like Shapiro-Wilk)? I highly suggest you either provide the results of the normality test to justify the use of t-test and ANOVA, or switch to their non-parametric equivalents (Mann-Whitney U and Kruskal-Wallis).

In the introduction, you aligned the study with the DPWH’s Quality Management System (QMS) and its pursuit of ISO 9001:2015 Certification. This is a very strong angle. However, you did not capitalize on this in your discussions and recommendations. Your recommendations are too



generic and operational, such as "installing accessible feedback channels" and "implementing an online complaint portal". For a journal of this caliber, the recommendations should be data-driven, strategic continuous quality improvement (CQI) interventions. How does the lack of a local materials testing lab directly affect the engineering integrity and ISO standards of the agency? Dig deeper into the technical policy implications rather than just basic customer service fixes.

Please thoroughly check your reference list for academic validity. You cited an unpublished preprint simply authored as "ResearchGate. (2026)". This is not an acceptable citation format for a journal. You need to trace the actual authors of that preprint or replace it with a properly published peer-reviewed article.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer 1</u>	<u>Reviewer 2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			