

**Paper: ““Soft” TQM and Performance of Local Government (A Case Study of Municipality of Tirana, Albania)”**

**Submitted: 08 September 2020**

**Accepted: 12 January 2021**

**Published: 31 January 2021**

Corresponding Author: Rezarta Hasanaj

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n1p46](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n1p46)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Lovergine Saverio  
Tor Vergata University of Rome, Italy

Reviewer 2: Evelina Bazini  
University “Ismail Qemali”Vlore, Albania

Reviewer 3: Angela Mucece Kithinji  
University of Nairobi, Kenya

# ***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: Saverio Lovergine  |                               |
| University/Country: INAPP, Tor Vergata University of Rome - Italy   |                               |
| Date Manuscript Received: 27/10/2020  | Date Review Report Submitted: |
| Manuscript Title: <b>SOFT” TQM and PERFORMANCE LOCAL GOVERNMENT-CASE STUDY, ALBANIA</b>                       |                               |
| <b>ESJ Manuscript Number: 0998/20</b>   |                               |
| 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><br>[Poor] 1-5<br>[Excellent] |
|--|---|
| <b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>                         | <b>4</b>  |
|  |   |
| <b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>                                  |   |
| <i>The abstract do not presents objects clearly; furthmore it do not presents methods and results.</i> |   |

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <i>In my opinion, an abstract should give the maximum of information with the minimum of word. In brief, it have to present : Why did you undertake the research; What did you study and what methods did you use; The results you obtained; How you interpreted them.</i> |          |
| <b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>   |          |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>   | <b>5</b> |
| <i>Well done.</i>  |          |
| <b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>   |          |
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>  | <b>3</b> |
| <i>The conclusion has been very poor. Any good recommendations are mentioned.</i>  |          |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</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):**

The work is a good job (Analysis, method and methodology are well done); some parts need to reviewed (Abstract and conclusion). The format review is required.

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

# ***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: Evelina Bazini  | Email:                                   |
| University/Country: University "Ismael Qemali" Vlore, Albania  |  |
| Date Manuscript Received: 5.11.2020  | Date Review Report Submitted: 13.11.2020 |
| Manuscript Title: "Soft" TQM and performance local government-case study – Albania                                   |  |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0998/20   |  |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>  |  |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b> |  |
| You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>                     |  |

## **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>   | <b><i>Rating Result</i></b><br>[Poor] 1-5<br>[Excellent] |
|--|--|
| <b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b> | <b>5</b>   |
| <i>The title is clear and adequate to the content of the article.</i>          |  |

|   |          |
|---|----------|
|   |          |
| <b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>             | <b>5</b> |
| <i>The abstract represent objects, research methods and results.</i>              |          |
| <b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b> | <b>5</b> |
| <i>No grammatical errors and spelling mistakes.</i>                               |          |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>                                | <b>5</b> |
| <i>The methodology used is clear.</i>   |          |
| <b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>             | <b>5</b> |
| <i>No errors in the body of the paper.</i>  |          |
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>   | <b>5</b> |
| <i>The conclusion is clear and it includes recommendations.</i>                   |          |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>                       | <b>5</b> |
| <i>ok</i>   |          |

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

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

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

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

# ***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 Angela Mucece Kithinji (PhD)  |  |
| University/Country: University of Nairobi, Kenya  |  |
| Date Manuscript Received: 22/09/2020  | Date Review Report Submitted: 26/09/2020 |
| Manuscript Title: “SOFT” TQM and PERFORMANCE LOCAL GOVERNMENT – CASE STUDY, ALBANIA                                     |  |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0998/20  |  |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    Yes/No    Yes  |  |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:    Yes/No    Yes |  |
| You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:    Yes/No    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><br>[Poor] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent] |
|--|---|
| <b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b> | <b>4</b>  |

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>  |          |
| <b>Edit the Title to include, performance of local, and the case study</b>  |          |
| <b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>   | <b>5</b> |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>  |          |
| <b>OK</b>   |          |
| <b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>   | <b>4</b> |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>  |          |
| <p><b>Proofread and edit the manuscript. Eg groth instead of growth, graph 2.3.3 overlaps the text, 7-10% age bracket etc.</b></p> <p><b>Consistency in numbering of the subheadings or not numbering at all. You start numbering subheadings from 1.3 to 2 and so one. Some subheadings are not numbered.</b></p> <p><b>Cite properly.</b></p> |          |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>  |          |
| <b>Data analysis not properly condensed and not articulate</b>  |          |
| <b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>   | <b>4</b> |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>  |          |
| <b>There are typos and numerical errors</b>   |          |
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>   | <b>4</b> |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>  |          |
| <b>Doesnot not mention the factors and their effect on performance. The authors have simply made sweeping statements in this section when they could have borrowed from the analysis and findings. The reader is not able to get the snap shot of what the study was about and what the findings were.</b>                                      |          |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>   | <b>4</b> |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>  |          |
| <i>Improve on citations</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):**

The authors should edit their work and ensure consistency in numbering the sections in the manuscript. The manuscript contributes significantly to the body of research. Research methodology and findings, and conclusions, should be crystal clear for the reader to grasp the research and research findings.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:  
To uphold the spirit of quality publications.**