Paper: **"Strategic Choice and Performance Empirical Evidence from Mission Hospitals in Kiambu County Kenya"**

Corresponding Author: Mary Wangui Njuguna

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Andrea Strelicz
University of Pannonia, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Okoli, Moses Ikechukwu
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: Okoli, Moses Ikechukwu	Email:
University/Country: Department of Cooperative Economics and Management, Faculty of Management sciences, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.	

Date Manuscript Received: 29th May, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 6th June, 2020
Manuscript Title: Strategic Choice and Performance Empirical Evidence From Mission Hospitals in Kiambu County Kenya	

ESJ Manuscript Number: 0648/20

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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**3**
The title of the paper is adequate but it has some punctuations and grammatical errors. I suggest that you punctuate the title to read thus: ***Strategic Choices and Performance: Empirical Evidence From Mission Hospitals in Kiambu County, Kenya***	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	**3**

results.	

The abstract is too lengthy. It should not be more than 300 words. I suggest you recast the abstract in short sentences to reflect the following:

   i.   The perceived problem that informed this study (Which could be as a result of the perceived rising customers patronage of mission hospitals against the public hospitals in Kiambu County, thus, suggesting the application of strategic choices in their healthcare delivery system in attracting and retaining customers).

   ii.   The objectives of the study (Specifically, the study aims to ascertain the influence of organizational, technology, leadership and resource acquisition on performance of mission hospitals in Kiambu County.

   iii.   Methodology employed (No mention was made of the statistical tools like the regression technique and ANOVA used in the abstract)

   iv.   Major findings

   v.   Recommendations

Like the title of the study, the abstract has some punctuations and grammatical errors. Apart from my comments, the areas marked red in the work are some the corrections made by me. They may not remain after you recast your abstract.

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**

I have highlighted a number of grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article for your correction. You can find them in the abstract and body of the article.

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**

   i.   No mention was made in the abstract of the statistical tools like the regression technique and ANOVA used in the study.

   ii.   There is no econometric or mathematical model of the variables in the methodology to show the cause and effect relationship of the variables used in the study.

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**3**

   i.   The last sentence in the background of study should be taken to methodology where proxies for the various independent variables and dependent variable are operationalized.

   ii.   Carefully edit the manuscript to address some structural errors.

   iii.   The statement of problem should start with the authors' perceived problem or public outcry that necessitated the study and not a problem cited from another author's work that was cited way back in 2016.

   iv.   As a guide, the statement of problem should address the following questions: what is the perceived problem or public outcry that necessitated the study, how topical and recent is the problem, what literature gap does this study intend to cover or what has related studies failed to do that this study intend to address.

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**

Findings, conclusions and recommendations should be clearly spelt out. The conclusions in this article cannot be separated from the findings.

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	

There is no consistency in the referencing style used. Some of the references were

not properly documented. Go through the references and do the needful.

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): Carefully go through the comments and effect the necessary corrections.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: Accept for publication after the corrections are affected.

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: Andrea Strelicz	
University/Country: University of Pannonia	
Date Manuscript Received: 2020.05.29	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: **STRATEGIC CHOICE AND PERFORMANCE EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE FROM MISSION HOSPITALS IN KIAMBU COUNTY KENYA**	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**

This part a little bit much. Mentioning of output recommendation are ok, but less detailed conclusion in abstract is appreciated	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**
It would increase the value of the paper if it contains the research model (instead of 2.1 model) *It would increase the value of the paper if it contains any detail about the questioner. for example, how many question group, how many questions under each group, what were the focus questions to each input points. The connection between conclusions and results are not clear. Results contain numbers and values from SPSS, but the these values don't refer to the conclusions clearly.*	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**3**
Please show KSH in parenthesis in page 3. *It shoud be considered to write about 2 sentences about Ogollah's result, because it is not clear why important the matching of the current result with his results* *It would be appreciated to check the ESJ requirements of the figure and table identification, and how to refer to figures and tables in body text*	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
The last paragraph mentions any point of competence increasing, but there is no information where this recommendation comes from.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**2**
The reference in body text recommended to check. In case of more than 2 authors, it preferred to give one author and ", at al". *In the reference list missing data also. APA requirement should check again* *Moulli (2011) on the page 2. does not exist in the reference list at the end of the paper* *Raquel Muigai on page 3.is not consistent with given in the references list* *On page 3. also Consumer Federation of Kenya are also a references, should be visible in the reference list* *Check Robbi & DeCerzo on page 4. and in the reference list also (Robbins, Stephen P./ De Cenzo, David A.)* *Please check Northouse's name and data in the reference list* *Gakenia (2015) on page 7 is missing from reference list* *Gitahi, A. W., & K'Obonyo, P. O. (2018). in references list, missing paper data*	

Cooper & Schindler, 2014 and (Ritchie, Lewis, & Elam, 2013) on page 9 are missing from reference list
Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2000). in reference list missing paper data
Ogollah (2012) on page 12 is missing from reference list
Torka, N., Schyns, B., &Looise, J. C. (2010) (in reference list) vs (Torkal & Loise, 2010) (in body text)

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):

Dear Mary and Stephen,

It is clear that the researched topic is important, and the effort behind of this research and paper is huge. I suggest you to rethink the structure of this paper and find the focus.
page 1 is abstract – OK
page 2 is introduction – OK
page 3-8 is literature – MUCH
page 9 is research methology – can be enough but ask the following question: What do you examine with regression? Why you have chosen the regression? (a few sentences)
page 10-13 – research findings (2,5 pages) could be more
page 13-14 – conclusions (1.5 pages) can be OK

Feel the rates. Literature size is maximum equal with the research introduction size, but don't be more, rather less.

I hope I gave you usable feedback. ☺
I wish the best

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: