

Paper: “Moderating Effect of Organizational Capability on the Relationship Between Business Intelligence Capability and Performance Among Public Listed Firms in Kenya”

Submitted: 23 November 2020

Accepted: 08 January 2021

Published: 31 January 2021

Corresponding Author: Edward Buhasho

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n1p335](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n1p335)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Paul Waithaka
Kenyatta University, Kenya

Reviewer 3: Remy Nyukorong
Stichting Kongregatie F.I.C., Maastricht, The Netherlands

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: Paul Waithaka	
University/Country: Kenyatta University/ Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 28/11/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 07/12/2020
Manuscript Title: Moderating Effect of Organizational Capability on the Relationship Between Business Intelligence Capability and Performance among Public Listed Firms in Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1238/20	
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.

<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
Title of the paper is clear	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3.5
Ensure to use capital letters for section subtitles such as Literature Review and others	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3.5
Ensure citations are properly done especially the use of et al.,	

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):

1. When citation several authors, provide the names of all of them in the first instance, in subsequent paragraphs use et al., This not what is in this paper. Even in the first paragraph the authors were not introduced
2. Ensure uniformity in numbering the figure e.g. Figure 1: as done on figure two
3. While reporting the finding ensure to use correct form e.g. R^2 instead of R2

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: Remy Nyukorong	
University/Country: Stichting Kongregatie F.I.C., Maastricht, The Netherlands	
Date Manuscript Received: 27-11-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 30-11-2020
Manuscript Title: Moderating Effect of Organizational Capability on The Relationship Between Business Intelligence Capability and Performance Among Public Listed Firms in Kenya.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1238/20	
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.

<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

<p>I agree that the title of the paper is clear, and it is adequate to the content of the paper.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 20 words title adequately describe the contents of the manuscript. • The main variables/key concepts of the study are captured. • The title has conveyed the important aspects of the research. 	
<p>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>In addition to being clear, readable, and brief (188 words), all the ingredients of an effective abstract are present.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That is, the purpose of the study, methods and procedure, results, and implications of the study are clearly stated in a logical order. • The authors have also provided key words, which will help indexers and search engines. 	
<p>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>I confirm that there are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this research paper.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • However, it will be prudent and in place if the authors can devote some time to proof-read the paper once more before it is published. • Even in its current state is readable and understandable. 	
<p>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>The research methods are appropriate to the objective of the study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the most part, the research methods are explained in detail. For instance, the authors have provided the rationale for adopting the cross-sectional mixed methods research design. They have also explained how the measurements were made, and what calculations were performed. Authors further stated which statistical tests were done to analyze the data. • The data analysis tools were also clearly explained. • All the above was done chronologically and in an orderly manner. 	
<p>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>I agree that the research findings based on the Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) and thematic analysis techniques are clear, accurate and do not contain errors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evidence, both statistical and qualitative, is presented. • Under the discussion section, authors explained what the results mean and how they relate to the literature. 	
<p>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>I concur that the conclusions are accurate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conclusions are drawn from the research findings. 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objective of the study is achieved with specific recommendations to managers and leaders of publicly listed firms in Kenya. • These suggestions enhance and motivate professionals to apply what the authors are proposing with full framework about future implications. • Limitations of the study are clearly stated and suggestions for future research outlined. 	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
I agree that the references are comprehensive and 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):

Major comments:

- Page 4, line 4: Authors should provide relevant literature sources for organizational learning theory (OLT). I propose the following references:
 1. Argyris, C., Schön, D. A. (1978). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
 2. Garvin, D. A. (1993). Building a learning organization. *Harvard Business Review*, 71, 78-91.
 3. Nonaka, I. (1991). The knowledge-creating company. *Harvard Business Review*, 69, 96-104.
- Aim to cover a representative set of theories in the OL domain (Argyris and Schon, 1978; Garvin, 1973; Nonaka, 1991). Reason for choosing these papers/authors is based on their seminal character and the high impact they have on research.
- Under 2.4 Organizational capability – Authors could also strengthen the conceptualization of organizational capability with more literature sources, such as: Kangas (1999) and Moingeon et al. (1998) refer to organizational capability as the strategic application of competencies. That is, their use and deployment to achieve given organizational goals (McGrath et al., 1995; Teece et al., 1997).
 1. Kangas, K., (1999). Competency and capabilities-based competition and the role of information technology: the case of trading by a Finland-based firm to Russia. *Journal of Information Technology Cases and Applications* 1(2), 4–22.
 2. McGrath, R.G., MacMillan, I.C., Venkatraman, S., (1995). Defining and developing competence: a strategic process paradigm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 16, 251–275.

3. Moingeon, B., Ramanantsoa, B., Me´tais, E., Orton, J.D., (1998). Another look at strategy–structure relationships: the resource-based view. *European Management Journal*, 16(3), 298–304.
4. Teece et al. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509-533.

Minor Comments:

- A conceptual model (in graphical form showing the relationship of the variables/constructs) immediately before the methodology section would have been appropriate (Refer to the paper of Buhasho et al., 2018).
- Under 4.4 Hypothesis Testing - Figure 1 is so tiny and difficult to read the contents. It may be better to leave it as an appendix. The same for figure 2.
- An interesting introduction to the paper. For instance, paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 provided useful statistics regarding investments in Business Intelligence & Analytics. Indeed, many companies invest huge resources in developing business analytics capabilities to improve their performance.
- Paragraph 4 of the introduction mentioned “various shortcomings” outlined in Melville et al. (2004) study. Is it possible for authors to list a few of these shortcomings??

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

- The topic is timely and will be of interest to the readers of the journal.
- The review of the literature is quite thorough, so the reader is given an adequate background about the topic.
- Overall, it is an important study, and should be considered for publication in the ESJ