



Paper: “Reverse Logistics and Competitive Advantage: The Mediating Effect of Operational Performance Among Manufacturing Firms in Kenya”

Corresponding Author: Job Lewela Mwanyota

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n19p217

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Vincent Machuki
UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI, KENYA

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Published: 31.07.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: Dr. Vincent Machuki	Email:
University/Country: UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI, KENYA	
Date Manuscript Received: 7th July 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 14th July 2020
Manuscript Title: Reverse Logistics And Competitive Advantage: The Mediating Effect Of Operational Performance Among Manufacturing Firms In Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 59.07.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

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>The phraseology of the title captures both the conceptual and contextual aspects of the study very clearly and depicts the empirical role played by each variable.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	4

results.	
<i>There are editorials to be addressed. The abstract should be enhanced to include the study's limitations and intimation of areas for further research.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The few grammatical errors have been pointed out in the body of the manuscript</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>No comment</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>No comment</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>There is no summary of key findings and conclusion. Instead what is labeled as Conclusion is actually a discussion of findings. So a section on Summary and Conclusion need to be introduced as well as the one on Limitations and Areas for Further Research.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Check to ensure consistency in adhering to the guidelines of the chosen style of referencing (APA)</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):

-Consider inclusion of the suggested sections in the body of the article to make it complete.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Thanks for giving me the opportunity to review this article.

