

**Paper: “Assessment of Vehicle Maintenance Culture and Its CostEffectiveness:
The Case of the University for Development Studies”**

Submitted: 05 October 2022

Accepted: 10 January 2023

Published: 31 January 2023

Corresponding Author: Joseph Attiah Seniwoliba

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n2p18](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n2p18)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Arlinda Ymeraj
Luarasi University, Albania

Reviewer 2: Gerxhi Julejda
University Alexander Moisiu Durres, Albania

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Prof.Assoc.Dr. Julejda Aliaj (Gërxhi)	
University/Country: Department of Law, Faculty of Political Sciences, University "Alexander Moisiu", Durres, Albania.	
Date Manuscript Received: 17.10.2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 24.10.2022
Manuscript Title: Assessment of vehicle maintenance culture and its cost effectiveness: The case of University for development studies	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 1068/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
------------------	--

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<p>The title of the article is quite clear and can be easily perceived by the readers. Through the words used in it such as maintenance culture, cost effectiveness, vehicles, the reader immediately understands what he will manage to find inside the article. Also, the title contains the necessary words to classify the article and directly gives the idea of the content of the paper.</p>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<p>The abstract includes all the necessary elements it must contain. We find a summary of the main points of the article. Also, the author has included in the key words and also touches on who are the research methods that were used. In addition, we also find the general conclusions of the paper along with the author's recommendation for the necessary steps to be taken to improve the situation.</p> <p>Research methods and material have been clearly presented throughout the development of the article, the structure of which consists of the following content: 1. Abstract (1 page), (briefly incorporate methods and results in the abstract); Introduction (2 pages); Problem Statement (1 page); Review of related literature: Concept of Maintenance (3 pages), Concept of Culture (1 page), The Role of Culture in Maintenance (2 pages), Cost-effective maintenance (1 page), Maintenance Planning and Scheduling Tools (2 pages) Methodology (1 page): Study Area, Data collection and procedure, Data Analysis; Results and discussion (6 pages): Maintenance and Repairs of University Vehicles, UDS Policy on vehicle maintenance, Factors militating against regular maintenance, The role of the Transport Committee, Cost of Maintenance, Age of Vehicle and cost of maintenance; Conclusion (1 page); Recommendations (1 page); References (5 pages).</p> <p>As for the results of the work, they are summarized in one sentence in the article and are also clearly presented at the end of it together with the author's respective recommendations.</p> <p>Likewise, keywords are found in the abstract and are appropriate to its content and the article.</p>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<p>At the end of the review of the article, it is noted that a clear language has been used that adheres to the linguistic standards and rules of spelling. No spelling mistakes are noticed which can damage the quality of the work. The author has used a language that suits the simple reader as well as the researcher as he has illustrated with scientific formulas and graphics the results of his work.</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5

The scientific research methods on this article are clearly presented during its development. The author has supported the research both in qualitative methods and in quantitative ones. Besides describing the methods used, he also illustrated them during the work through graphs and tables. During the explanation of the methods used, the author has clearly explained the area of study, the way in which the data were collected and processed and how these data were analyzed. The concrete data that are related to the costs of used vehicles, their depreciation costs and what would be necessary to maintain them have supported the results of this research.

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.

5

The author has elaborated in detail all the results obtained from the study and accompanied them with concrete data, accompanied by the relevant tables related to the costs of vehicle maintenance. In order to make the results clearer for the readers, he has divided the results of the study into several main points. They behave in a coherent manner and do not contain errors in their presentation.

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.

5

The conclusions of the paper are presented at the end of the results, thus following a logical flow of the development of the article. They have a clear connection with the entire content of the work. The conclusions summarize all the results that the author has managed to draw through his research, thus conveying the purpose that this study had and that we find in the title of this article. In the review of all the components, a coherence of events is observed, which was respected by the author in order to convey the result to the readers in the purest way possible.

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.

5

The author has given a special importance to the references, giving a considerable space to their presentation even during the material and by listing and clearly presenting them at the end of the paper. This facilitates the work of the reviewer of the article to clearly verify the sources and to see the way in which they have been used and continued throughout the paper. This is worth noting, as in this way the sources are respected, and it is also clear which data was used and how it was processed.

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In general, the article is clear and is a genuine study based on accurate research data. The author has addressed within this topic some important points that are not simply related to the maintenance of the vehicles of an institution, but also deals with important elements that lead to the lack of maintenance, elements such as the weak culture of maintenance, the lack of funds, the lack of an additional component within the institution that would have maintenance as its main role. On these important elements that the author has dealt with, he has also given value to his concrete recommendations that would help the situation created in relation to this topic.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The suggestions that belong to the editors are closely related to the article's structure. In order for it to be clear to the reader and the material to be easily perceptible, there should be a chronological and logical connection of the events and main points covered in the article.

The structure followed by the author is generally correct and contains all the key elements needed in its table of contents:

Title of work and author details;

1. Abstract (1 page), (briefly incorporate methods and results in the abstract);
2. Introduction (2 pages)
 - 2.1 Problem Statement (1 page)
3. Review of related literature
 - 3.1 Concept of Maintenance (3 pages)
 - 3.2 Concept of Culture (1 page)
 - 3.3 The Role of Culture in Maintenance (2 pages)
 - 3.4 Cost-effective maintenance (1 page)
 - 3.5 Maintenance Planning and Scheduling Tools (2 pages)
4. Methodology (1 page)
 - 4.1 Study Area
 - 4.2 Data collection and procedure
 - 4.3 Data Analysis
5. Results and discussion (6 pages)
 - 5.1 Maintenance and Repairs of University Vehicles
 - 5.2 UDS Policy on vehicle maintenance
 - 5.3 Factors militating against regular maintenance
 - 5.4 The role of the Transport Committee
 - 5.5 Cost of Maintenance
 - 5.6 Age of Vehicle and cost of maintenance
6. Conclusion (1 page)
7. Recommendations (1 page)
8. References (5 pages)

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Arlinda Ymeraj	
University/Country: Luarasi University, Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: 21 October	Date Review Report Submitted: 24 October
Manuscript Title: Assessment of vehicle maintenance culture and its cost effectiveness: the case of University for Development Studies.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1068/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>Yes, the title is clear and adequate to the content of the article</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The abstract clearly presents methods, while objectives are not well formulated. In addition, the results are missing.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are few spelling mistakes in this article (Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The study methods are explained clearly. They are founded in the literature. However, the arguments on the added value of the research for a wider audience are missing. (Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are clear, do not contain any errors, although they are valid only in the given context of the given research. The sample size is small. Besides that, the research framework is very specific, therefore some arguments to support a wider importance of the results, are necessary to be formulated.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusions are accurate and fully supported by the content. However, the comments formulated in the point 5 and 4 are relevant here as well.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>There is a very long list of references, although very few are mentioned in the article. Some of them are very old.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- Revision of abstract
- Argue the added value of the research for a wider audience
- Explain the validity of the research in a wider context than the given context.
- Revise literature and adjust references.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: