EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute ESI
10 YEARS

Paper: **"Student Satisfaction with Hostel Facilities: A Case Study of Njala University, Njala Campus, Sierra Leone"**

Submitted: 27 October 2022
Accepted: 29 November 2022
Published: 30 November 2022

Corresponding Author: Samuel Maxwell Tom Williams

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n31p136

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Richard Wadsworth
Njala University, Sierra Leone

Reviewer 2: Amaya Epelde Larranaga Larranaga
University of Granada, Spain

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Title is fine

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Abstract is fine

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

formatting of references in the paper is inconsistent.
Some grammatical errors.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodology should have;
1) ranked the facilities by what the students wanted, then examined the gap between what was offered and what was provided
2) when putting numbers to the sentiment, it makes more sense to put positive numbers to positive sentiments and negative numbers to negative sentiments, so the numeric scale should run +2, +1, 0, -1, -2 from strongly agree to strongly disagree etc. In this way the average value automatically tells you whether the general sentiment is positive or negative.
3) there needs to be some consideration of the economics of the hostels, are they viewed as a cost center or a revenue center?
4) there has been no new build or substantial restoration for ~15 years why is this? it needs to be investigated.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

see methodological issues above, in addition where there is a clear natural sequence in categories this should be used, for example categories (rows) in table 2 are listed alphabetically rather than in any logical order.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Without consideration of the economics or the attitude of the University authorities the conclusions are unsupported.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

seems ok

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1**-**5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

You need to gather data on the attitude of the Administration and the economics of the hostels
I don't like the way you have coded sentiment into numbers
You should order the rows in table 2 so they make sense (follow a logical order)

Diarassouba Ibrahim

Remarque d'ordre général

- L'auteur a fait un bon résumé, une belle description de sa méthodologie, ses résultats. Aussi, la question de recherche qui oriente son travail est claire.
- Cependant, l'auteur n'a fait qu'une description des résultats présentés dans les différents tableaux, mais pas une analyse. Il nous décrit simplement les résultats, sans nous dire ce qui explique ces résultats
- **Voici quelques questions auxquelles l'auteur doit répondre pour bonifier son travail**
    1. Qu'est-ce qui explique cette différence importante (100) de nombre d'enquête entre homme et femme ? Car il affirme avoir interrogé 291 hommes et 191 femmes une différence soit de 100 personnes. Qu'est-ce qui explique cette différence,
    2. Quel est le coût moyen par emplacement comparé au coût des auberges ? Cela donnera plus de clarté dans la compréhension de l'analyse
    3. Pourquoi vous ne présentez pas les données et en faire une analyse relativement au coût des loyers selon le statut des enquêtés : Mariés ? Célibataires ? Veufs/Veuves ? Divorcés. Cela permettra de savoir si le statut si les statuts influents ou pas les réponses

Recommendation: Accept Submission

Reviewer G:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes, the title is clear, adequate and complete.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract presents all the elements.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

No comments, I am not an expert in english.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The authors speak about a methodology, the observation, that is not correct for this kind of research. They dont show any results from this methodology. It is necesssary to remove the metholology of observation from the document.

Also, I miss the procedure of collecting information through questionnaires.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is well structured.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

In the discussion and conclusion section there are non-coherent sentences, sentences that have no connection with the results obtained.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references are appropriate but it is necessary to check APA style for this references list.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

See attached document.
