

Manuscript: “**Organizational Conflict Management: The All Important Public Universities Performance Strategy Under Neglect in Kenya**”

Submitted: 15 March 2021

Accepted: 02 April 2021

Published: 30 April 2021

Corresponding Author: Gertrude Muthoni Mwaniki

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n12p181

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Enriko Ceko, Wisdom University, Albania

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

I am not a native speaker of the English language, but I find that the paper is well-written.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.
(Please insert your comments)

Yes.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2

- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes. Is clear and adequate to the content of the article

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The abstract is clear and presents object and results, while at methods, use of regression and ANOVA should have been mentioned. The authors can add this important part of the method used in just one sentence. Methodology is missing. A couple of sentences for methodology is needed.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

There are no grammatical errors and mistakes, while reducing the space of the article through generalizing the literature older than 2014, can be helpful (avoiding quotations and citations, using paraphrasing and overview for such literature).

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Methodology is not explained while method(s) used is clear enough to understand well the issue. So, before explaining method(s), a couple of sentences about the methodology is needed.

About hypothesis, in the article are listed only four Ho hypothesis, which can be listed Ho(1), Ho(2), Ho(3) and Ho(4). On the other hand, the opposite hypothesis which must be H1(1), H1(2), H1(3) and H1(4) are not mentioned at all.

So, adding these opposite hypothesis helps to understand better the issue and writing conclusions too.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors, but is a bit longer than a normal article which can explain the issue using an efficient space, as well as in the body of the text, the opposite hypothesis (1) must be added, directly after O hypothesis.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusion is accurate, but 1 hypothesis must be added to clarify better the situation, mentioning that these 1 hypothesis are the hypothesis which verify the initial questions raised by the study.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

Yes.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3

- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I think, a two weeks time should be given to author(s) to correct the article especially on the issue of methodology and 1 hypothesis, conclusions and reducing space of the article generalizing the literature before 2014.