

Paper: “The relationship between Competitive Strategy Drivers and Performance of manufacturing Small and Medium Enterprises in Nairobi County, Kenya”

Submitted: 23 December 2020

Accepted: 23 January 2021

Published: 31 January 2021

Corresponding Author: Victor Laibuni Baariu

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n1p102

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Davide Calandra
University of Turin, Italy

Reviewer 2: László Berényi
University of Miskolc, Hungary

Reviewer 3: Dimitrios Belias
University of Thessaly, Greece

Reviewer 4: Onyeaghala, Obioma, H.
Federal University Wukari, State, Nigeria

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: Davide Calandra	
University/Country: University of Turin (Italy)	
Date Manuscript Received: 04/01/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 05/01/2021
Manuscript Title: The relationship between Competitive Strategy Drivers and Performance of manufacturing Small and Medium Enterprises in Nairobi County, Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 18.01.2021	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the	5

article.	
The title is clear and adequate.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The abstract has all the elements required and summarized in a good way all the scientific articles.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>I suggest a final reading before the publication.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<p>The first part of the method needs to clearly explain why this method is vital to address the paper's aim. I suggest considering the proper references for quantitative studies. Then please, explain how you are selecting all the elements for the present questionnaire and motivate with a scientific reference.</p> <p>Additionally, more elements should be addressed to understand how authors select their audience and how they implement the interview (oral, written, software)? In that case, how last the interview?</p> <p>Finally, the method should also explain what kind of tools the authors used to do their analysis. For example, STATA, SPSS, Excel? Others?</p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Results are interesting and relevant. Thank you.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
The conclusion is accurate. I suggest the authors strengthen the theoretical and practical implications and giving a future research agenda for researchers. Thank you and all the best!	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>References need to be improved.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------	--------------------------

Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In the **introduction**, I would suggest the authors to explain the citation references for the following sentence: “*For this study, the resource-based strategy drivers comprise of manufacturing SMEs capital raising capacity, technology development, human capital and Value Chain. Organizations ability to raise capital has a strategic bearing on their competitiveness.*”

Additionally, the section needs to be restructured. It should have the following elements:

- Background of the paper (present);
- The gap that the paper aims to address (present);
- A brief method identification (to be addressed);
- The main results and implications of the paper (to strengthen);
- The map of the paper with the following paragraphs.

In the literature section, authors miss several essential new references in this field. I would suggest the authors also to consider previous literature published related to the case under investigation (Kenya).

You may find interesting the following papers:

Sadeghi, V. J., & Biancone, P. P. (2018). How micro, small and medium-sized enterprises are driven outward the superior international trade performance? A multidimensional study on Italian food sector. *Research in International Business and Finance*, 45, 597-606.

Jafari-Sadeghi, V., Dutta, D.K., Ferraris, A. and Del Giudice, M. (2020), "Internationalisation business processes in an under-supported policy contexts: evidence from Italian SMEs", *Business Process Management Journal*, Vol. 26 No. 5, pp. 1055-1074. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BPMJ-03-2019-0141>

Mensah, E. K., & Sadeghi, V. J. (2018). Entrepreneurial opportunity decisions under uncertainty: Conceptualizing the complementing role of personal and cognitive abilities.

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!

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 11/01/2021
Manuscript Title: The relationship between Competitive Strategy Drivers and Performance of manufacturing Small and Medium Enterprises in Nairobi County, Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

The title is not very clear but adequate to the content of article. It needs to be reshaped.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results but should be revised	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There are few grammatical errors, especially the use of articles and conjunctions	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The study methods are explained clearly	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The references are comprehensive and not very appropriate	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Effect corrections to upgrade the quality of the paper

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Ensure all corrections are effected by the author(s) before publication of the paper.

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: 11/01/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 12/01/2021
Manuscript Title: The relationship between Competitive Strategy Drivers and Performance of manufacturing Small and Medium Enterprises in Nairobi County, Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 18.01.2021	
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.	4

<i>The title is a bit long but includes all necessary information and limitations about the paper's scope.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The abstract is appropriate.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>A final grammar review and proofreading is necessary. A native proofreader and/or any software in the field could be useful.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>There are usual empirical and statistical methods applied, the applications are correct.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>I found the result correct, on their own. But there is an issue that needs clarification: the authors' contributions (see more in the comments).</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Conclusions are built on the results; the chapter is comprehensive.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>I found the references and way of managing them appropriate.</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):

Technically a thorough grammar check is necessary before the publication. Also, check editing (., ' etc.)!

A more serious problem is about the authors. Although I marked minor revision above, this issue is elementary. The personal contribution should be declared. This is not a copied idea from other journals, this is special for this paper. The notes declare that it is an extract from a PhD dissertation. This is not a problem, in fact, it is to welcome that PhD level results are submitted to the journal. I checked the text with Turnitin plagiarism check; it confirms this fact. 54% similarity index, 34 from the

dissertation. Based on the notification, I keep it acceptable. But: if it is the work of the author, what is the contribution of the other authors? Please, make this clear!

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Please, check the comments to the authors, it is about an important question/problem!

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: 08/01/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 14/01/2021
Manuscript Title: The relationship between Competitive Strategy Drivers and Performance of manufacturing Small and Medium Enterprises in Nairobi County, Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There aren't grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The study methods are explained clearly</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are clear and do not contain errors</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusions is accurate and supported by the content</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	x
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: