

**Paper: “Quality Planning and Project Success in Electricity Supply Infrastructure Projects in Kenya; A Case of Transmission Infrastructure Projects”**

**Submitted: 23 August 2023**

**Accepted: 23 September 2023**

**Published: 30 September 2023**

Corresponding Author: Lee Alubala Okombe

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n25p53](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n25p53)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Murry Siyasiya

Malawi Institute of Journalism; and Blantyre International University

Reviewer 2: Wanjiru Nderitu

Africa Nazarene University, Kenya

Reviewer 3: Blinded

-----  
Reviewer C:  
Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

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

Well coined and relevant topic.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Well-articulated topic although use of 'hypothesis is accepted' in abstract is questionable. Hypotheses are stated in negative and the findings are negative with respect to the hypothesis, we say 'we fail to reject the hypothesis'. If the alternative hypothesis is accepted as in this case, the null hypothesis is simply rejected. This is so because sometimes it is an issue of data to reject or fail to reject a hypothesis.

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

Yes.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Yes, well explained but project success, a crucial variable, is not well defined in the study.

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

Yes.

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

Yes.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Yes.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

My main worry is that project success, a crucial variable, is not well defined as used in this study. It is very important to explain this. Otherwise, the study findings are not correct if this is not resolved. On similar note, the study methods lack necessary theoretical background. I can also see that the Goodness of Fit is very low as well, defeating whatever model used in this study.

-----

-----  
Reviewer F:  
Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----

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

Yes, it is.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Yes. The abstract is presenting the objectives, the method used and some of the results.

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

Not to my knowledge.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Yes.

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

Indeed.

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

Yes.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Yes

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

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

4

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, no revision needed

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

-----

-----  
Reviewer G:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

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

The title is clear and its rhymes with the content of the article.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract describes the objective of the study which is was to "assess the influence of quality planning on project success among electricity supply infrastructure projects in Kenya". However, though the Author has indicated a Sample size of 80 Employees ; the Unit of analysis(Population) is missing from the abstract; but well indicated on the methodology section.

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

Yes, there few grammatical errors in this article, that require typos cleaning .

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Pearson correlation and regression analysis were used for testing the hypotheses; which indicated the results after hypothesis testing.

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

The Body is clear; but ought to sub-head the "statement of the problem" since the Introduction section is too long!

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

The conclusion is accurate following the descriptive analysis table of the study objective including the inferential statistic findings as indicated.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Yes, the List of references is appropriate; though may not be comprehensive .

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

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

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

The Author need to include " the Population size from the abstract; where sample size was deduced from. The Introduction section is unnecessarily long ; need to unpack the "statement of the Problem" as a brief section from the long introduction. The Discussion section lacks the authors voice; good to beef it up with some of his observations during data collection to add a voice as the researcher.

-----