



**Paper: “Quality Management Practices and Performance: The Perspective of Public Healthcare Institutions in Kenya”**

**Submitted: 08 January 2025**

**Accepted: 08 February 2025**

**Published: 28 February 2025**

Corresponding Author: Dorcas Nyangulika Jumapili

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n4p83

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Robert Szucs  
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Valentin Marian Antohi  
University Dunarea de Jos of Galati, Romania

### ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

**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: Prof. dr. Antohi Valentin Marian	
University/Country: Dunarea de Jos University of Galati, Romania	
Date Manuscript Received: 27.01.2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 29.01.2025
Manuscript Title: <b>Quality Management Practices and Performance: Where are we, and where we are headed? The Perspective of Public Healthcare Institutions in Kenya</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0144/25	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The title, "Quality Management Practices and Performance: Where are we, and where we are headed? The Perspective of Public Healthcare Institutions in Kenya", is clear and provides insight into the study. However, it can be made more concise by eliminating redundant wording.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The executive summary presents the objectives, methodology and findings of the study, but could be more structured:</i>	

<i>-Reword the results to explicitly highlight the impact of customer focus, continuous improvement and top management commitment.</i>	
<i>-Ensure clarity by avoiding redundancy and maintaining a logical flow.</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Although the manuscript is well-written, there are several grammatical inconsistencies and awkward sentence structures. A thorough proofreading is needed, focusing on grammar, punctuation and sentence structure.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The methodology section is comprehensive and well structured, but some clarifications are needed. Although the study uses a stratified random sampling technique , further justification of why this method was chosen over others is recommended. The description of the regression analysis should provide justification for the selection of the multiple regression model. Explain why Cronbach's Alpha of 0.7 was chosen as the threshold for reliability.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The results are well presented with clear tables and statistical interpretations. However, improvements can be made. Make sure that the tables are properly formatted and labeled, especially in tables 4-6. Some statistical values do not have confidence intervals or standard deviations, which should be included.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The conclusions are logical and supported by results, but could be more concise and incisive. Repetitive statements on the importance of Total Quality Management (TQM) could be removed. Explicitly align the conclusions with the research objectives.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>References are comprehensive and relevant, but you may consider updating references published before 2018 to include more recent studies.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>x</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

### **ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025**

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

***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: Dr. Róbert Sándor Szűcs	
University/Country: University of Debrecen, Hungary	
Date Manuscript Received: 29.01.2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 30.01.2025
Manuscript Title: Quality Management Practices and Performance: Where are we, and where we are headed. The Perspective of Public Healthcare Institutions in Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 44.01.2025	
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.**

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Rating Result</b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
The title "Quality Management Practices and Performance: Where are we, and where we are headed. The Perspective of Public Healthcare Institutions in Kenya" is precise and clearly reflects the content of the paper. It specifies the focus on quality management practices and their impact on performance within the context of Kenyan public healthcare institutions.	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>4</b>

The abstract succinctly outlines the objects, methods, and results. It mentions the use of Scorecard and Six Sigma theories and the application of a descriptive research design with a focus on specific quality management practices. However, it could be improved by briefly stating the main findings to better summarize the impact of these practices on performance.	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
The paper contains a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. Although these are minor, they slightly detract from the overall professionalism of the publication but do not impede understanding.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
The study methods are explained with clarity. The paper describes the research design, population, sampling techniques, and data analysis methods in detail, providing a clear understanding of how the study was conducted.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
The results are clearly presented with statistical evidence, showing significant effects of quality management practices on performance. Tables and quantitative data are well utilized, making the results section informative and straightforward.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
The conclusions are accurate and well-supported by the content and findings within the paper. The summary ties back to the research objectives and adequately reflects the evidence presented.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
The references are comprehensive and relevant, supporting the paper's content and enhancing its credibility. The bibliography includes a wide range of sources that cover both the theoretical and empirical aspects of the study.	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>X</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

Overall, this scientific paper is well-constructed, with minor issues in spelling and grammar that do not significantly affect its quality. The research is robust, and the findings are clearly communicated and supported by the data.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**