

Paper: “Examining the Effect of Organizational Culture on the Relationship between Supply Chain Quality Management Practices Adoption and Performance of Private Hospitals in Kenya”

Submitted: 07 October 2020

Accepted: 05 November 2020

Published: 30 November 2020

Corresponding Author: Tobias Okoth Ondiek

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n31p147](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n31p147)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gulali Indiya Donald
Maseno University, Kenya

Reviewer 2: László Berényi
University of Miskolc, Hungary

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: László Berényi	
University/Country: University of Miskolc/Hungary	
Date Manuscript Received: 29.10.2020.	Date Review Report Submitted: 30.10.2020.
Manuscript Title: Examining the Effect of Organizational Culture on Supply Chain Quality Management Practices adoption and Performance of Private Hospitals in Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 90.10.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	

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.	4
The title is quite long but describes the main point of the analysis	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract includes too much of statistical methods. I suggest a higher emphasis to the problems and the conclusion. Avoid using abbreviations in the abstract.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
The text needs thorough grammar and language review. Understanding of the text is not limited, but too much of small annoying mistakes have remained.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The methods are popular and usual in the field.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
The explanation is correct; excluding the grammar problems, the text is acceptable. I suggest giving a higher emphasis in the discussion and conclusion sections to answering the original research questions rather than repeating the model results.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
It is a good summary of the model; a higher emphasis on the real conclusion could be added.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
Managing references is appropriate.	

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):

I consider the modifications as a minor revision, but these are important at all! The grammar review and the rethinking of the abstracts and the conclusion may improve the understanding and may lead to a better impact of the paper.