

Paper: “Understanding Strategy Implementation: Progress along Performance of Meru County Government in Kenya”

Submitted: 12 September 2022

Accepted: 25 June 2022

Published: 31 October 2022

Corresponding Author: Kelvin Mutuma Ntoiti

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n31p52](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n31p52)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Honfoga Barthelemy G.
Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Benin

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer E:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Yes

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The study methodology was not highlighted. How were the independent variables measured. What were the precise and measurable indicator of each of them? The same applies for the dependent variable "Performance".

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

Minor errors.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The sampling is poorly explained, and the theoretical variables' operationalization is absent.

Before presenting the regression model, you should say how the model variables were measured. The model specification presented here is too bold and cannot be easily understood. The Xs here cannot be individual variables. They appear like vector of variables. Indeed, for example, "Resource allocation" is a vector that may include several variables such as: rate of achievement in budget consumption, allocation equity (as per planned budget allocation to various activities), swiftness in expenditures (as per planned dates), etc. The same applies for "Organization culture", "Leadership" and "Organizational structure". If you did not take them as vectors of variables, which unique indicators did you use for each?

Finally, class lessons should be avoided in a methodology. Authors should stick to what they did, how and why, with reference to reliable research tools.

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

Good.

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

Yes. But the study methodology is poorly explained and do lend any trust to the research results.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Good.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Very relevant paper for entrepreneurial coaching. The study methodology should be detailed. Variables' operationalization is missing.
