



**Manuscript: “Sustainable Operations Management Practices and Competitive Advantage of Manufacturing Firms in Kenya”**

**Submitted: 1 August 2020**

**Accepted: 17 October 2020**

**Published: 31 October 2020**

Corresponding Author: Rehema Swalehe

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n28p241

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Daniela Breveníková  
University of Economics in Bratislava, Slovakia

**Reviewer 2:** Gedas Baranauskas  
Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania

**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: Daniela Breveníková	Email:
University/Country: University of Economics in Bratislava, Slovakia	
Date Manuscript Received: 11 September	Date Review Report Submitted: 14 September 2020
Manuscript Title: <b>Sustainable Operations Management Practices and Competitive Advantage of Manufacturing Firms in Kenya</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 58.08.2020	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
The title clearly reflects the content of the paper.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>The abstract is well-written, and it clearly presents both objects and methods of the research, as well as its results. It provides a useful source of information to readers.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>There are few grammatical mistakes in the paper. There occur some misprints in the spelling of names. Most adjustments (highlighted in red) relate to punctuation (semicolon instead of comma). (See Encl. Paper after proofreading)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The study methods are explained clearly and utilized adequately. Results of analysis are presented in tables.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The text is written in a clear style, and its structure corresponds to requirements placed on that of the research paper. The authors express their approaches and ideas logically.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The conclusion and recommendation section is adequate; it summarizes the content of the research paper and contains logical and relevant recommendations both for further research and practice.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The references represent an interesting and source of relevant materials. In the enclosure (Paper after proofreading), names of several authors in the References which I have not found in the body of the paper are highlighted in red.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>x</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Thank you for a well-written research paper.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**Suggested adjustments are in the file *Paper after proofreading* enclosed.**

# ***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!***

Date Manuscript Received: 12.08.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 20.08.2020
Manuscript Title: Sustainable Operations Management Practices and Competitive Advantage of Manufacturing Firms in Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0858/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    No	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
The title is clear and adequate to the content of the article, no additional comments.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results, but should be more concentrated and reduced to a recommended limit of 250 words.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>

Main recommendation – avoid using non-scientific expressions/language like <i>in some previous years, most of the studies reviewed, these studies were on some of the facets of SOMPs, some researchers</i> . These constructs of the non-scientific language do not add value to a scientific paper and seem ambiguous, therefore, should be supported with detailed references to sources.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
The paper consists of a comprehensive and well-grounded presentation of selected study methods and methodology.	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
References are missing at Tables and Figures. Requirements of APA style for in-text citation should be revised and applied in the paper.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
The Conclusions and Recommendations part is detailed and logical, but the scope should be reduced as well as theoretical insights are questionable due to a structure of references (please look at comment in point 7).	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
The research should be updated with analyses of research of the latest years in a selected research field. Only 5 scientific references are up to 5 years old, therefore, it is doubtful if authors present the selected research field in the state of the art. In addition, I would recommend reviewing and elaborating theoretical findings and relevance of their scientific contribution.	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

No additional comments and/or suggestions to the Authors

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

No additional comments and/or suggestions to the Editors