



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Hospital Management Practices and Organizational Performance at the Moramanga District Referral Hospital Center, Madagascar”

Submitted: 16 June 2026

Accepted: 15 September 2026

Published: 30 September 2026

Corresponding Author: Ravaka Niaina Andriamiarisoa

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n27p91

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Rozeta Shahinaj
Medical University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 2: Jorida Zoga
University “Aleksander Moisiu”, Department of Medical Sciences, Durrës, Albania

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 25/6/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/6/2026
Manuscript Title: Hospital Management: The Case of the District Referral	
Hospital Center of Moramanga	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: NO	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3

The title in its current form is **not sufficiently precise** for a research study. The main issue is that "**Hospital Management**" is too broad, the author should narrow the title to a specific aspect of hospital management so that he clearly indicate which aspect of hospital management is being investigated thus,

1. **What exactly do you mean by hospital management?** (Leadership, human resource management, financial management, logistics, governance, quality assurance, etc.)
2. **What is the main problem being studied?**
3. **What is the outcome or dependent variable?** (Service delivery, patient satisfaction, hospital performance, quality of care, efficiency, etc.)

Until the above aspects are addressed, the title is too broad and may make it difficult to formulate clear objectives, research questions, and hypotheses.

The title:

Hospital Management: The Case of the District Referral Hospital Center of Moramanga

reads more like a case study or report than a research title. A good research title should identify:

- The **independent variable(s)** or phenomenon under investigation.
- The **dependent variable(s)** or outcome, thus problem of the study.
- The **study setting** or population.

Beneath are the suggestion of various titles.

- Hospital Management Practices: A Case Study of the District Referral Hospital Center of Moramanga.
- Influence of Hospital Management Practices at the District Referral Hospital Center of Moramanga.
- Determinants Influencing Hospital Management Performance: A Case Study of the District Referral Hospital Center of Moramanga.
- The Effect of Hospital Management Practices on Service Delivery at the District Referral Hospital Center of Moramanga.
- Hospital Management Constraints and Their outcome on Healthcare Service Delivery: A Case Study of the District Referral Hospital Center of Moramanga.

I therefore recommend refining the title to reflect the specific variables being investigated rather than using the general term "Hospital Management."

(Please insert your comments)

(Please insert your comments) The abstract is fairly well structured, but it has several weaknesses that should be addressed before publication. My observations are as follows:

1. Title: Abstract (KEY ISSUES OF INTEREST)

The title is:

Hospital Management: The Case of the District Referral Hospital Center of Moramanga

However, the abstract states:

"...identify the components of hospital management and assess the practices and approaches implemented..."

This indicates that the study is about **hospital management practices**, not hospital management in general. The title should therefore reflect this more precisely, for example:

**The Effect of Hospital Management Practices on Service Delivery at the District Referral Hospital Center of Moramanga.
(OR ANY OF THE SUGGESTIONS MADE ABOVE)**

2. Background

The background is too general.

Hospital management remains a major challenge for ensuring quality care...

It does not explain:

- What management problem exists at Moramanga Hospital.
- Why this hospital was selected.
- What knowledge gap the study intends to fill.

A stronger background should briefly identify the specific problem that justified the study.

3. Objective

The objective is reasonably clear.

"...identify the components of hospital management and assess the practices and approaches..."

However, "**identify the components**" is weak because hospital management components are already well established in the literature.

It would be stronger to state:

"To examine hospital management practices and organizational performance at the District Referral Hospital Center of Moramanga."

4. Methods

The methods section is generally adequate.

However, some important details are missing:

- Sample size.
- Number of interview participants.
- Sampling technique.
- Type of mixed-methods design (convergent, explanatory sequential, exploratory sequential, etc.).
- Statistical methods used.

Simply saying

"All staff members"

does not tell the reader how many participants were involved, thus in every population you need to identify the number of participants.

5. Results (Major Weakness)

The results provide descriptive statistics but fail to relate them to the objective.

For example, Budget execution rate 99.5% is reported without explaining whether this reflects good management.

Similarly, Equipment coverage 80.94%, What benchmark defines this as satisfactory?

Likewise, Bed occupancy declined...Why? What does this imply?

The results should interpret the findings and give further explanation aligning them with the literature review rather than merely present figures.

6. Missing Key Findings

The objective mentions:

- management practices
- approaches

Yet the results mainly report hospital performance indicators.

There is little discussion of:

- leadership
- planning
- human resource management
- Financial Management
- governance
- quality assurance
- supervision
- communication

These are expected under hospital management. Consider having the mentioned aspects incorporated.

7. Conclusion

The conclusion is only partially supported.

It suddenly recommends:

- increasing medical staffing
- improving accommodation
- increasing revenue

Yet these issues are not clearly presented in the results. The conclusion should summarize the principal findings before making recommendations.

For example:

The study found that although financial management and equipment availability were satisfactory, declining hospital utilization and low bed occupancy indicate persistent

management challenges that require strengthening human resources, infrastructure, and service quality.

8. Missing Implications

A good abstract should indicate why the findings matter.

For example:

These findings provide evidence to guide hospital managers and policymakers in strengthening management systems and improving healthcare delivery.

9. Keywords

Consider the abstract to have at least 6 keywords.

Example:

Hospital management; Health service delivery; Hospital performance; Donabedian model; Quality of care; Madagascar.

Overall Assessment

Component	Rating	Observation
Background	Fair	Too general; does not clearly identify the research gap.
Objective	Good	Clear but could be more specific about what is being evaluated.
Methods	Good	Well described but lacks sample size, sampling technique, and analytical details.
Results	Fair	Presents statistics without sufficient interpretation or linkage to the study objective.
Conclusion	Fair	Recommendations are not fully supported by the reported findings.
Title: Abstract Alignment	Fair	The abstract focuses on hospital management practices, whereas the title is overly broad.

Overall Verdict

The abstract demonstrates a sound study and follows the conventional structure (Background, Methods, Results, and Conclusion). However, it requires revision to improve the alignment between the title, objectives, results, and conclusions. The abstract should more clearly identify the research problem, report findings directly related to hospital management practices, interpret the reported indicators, and ensure that the conclusions are firmly supported by the results. As written, I would rate it 7.5/10 and recommend minor revision before publication.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The manuscript is grammatically understandable. Writing reflects a competent draft but would benefit from professional language editing before publication.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The Methods section is clear however, it lacks sufficient detail to evaluate the rigor and reproducibility of the study. Beneath are aspects of concern, 1. The study design is stated, but the rationale for combining evaluative, retrospective, descriptive, cross-sectional, and mixed-methods approaches is not adequately explained. 2. The methods section provides insufficient detail on the mixed-methods design. The authors should clarify how the quantitative and qualitative components were integrated during data collection and analysis. 3. Although exhaustive sampling is mentioned, the actual sample size and participant response rate are not reported, making it difficult to assess the representativeness of the findings. 4. The description of the data collection instruments is brief. Expand More information on the development, validity, reliability, and content of the survey forms and observation grids is required. 5. The variables are categorized according to the Donabedian model; however, the specific indicators used to measure structure, process, and outcomes should be clearly defined. 6. The data analysis procedures require further elaboration. The authors should explain how qualitative data were analyzed and whether any inferential statistical analyses were performed in addition to descriptive statistics. 7. The methods section does not mention ethical approval, informed consent procedures, or measures taken to ensure confidentiality, which are essential for studies involving human participants and health issues. 8. The methodology would benefit from a clearer sequence of study setting, design, study population, sampling, data collection, variables, data analysis, and ethical considerations to improve clarity and readability.	

Overall comment

The methodology provides a general overview of the study procedures; however, additional methodological details are required to enhance clarity, transparency, and reproducibility. Greater explanation of the study design, sampling procedures, data collection instruments, data analysis methods, and ethical considerations would strengthen the scientific rigor of the manuscript.

(Please insert your comments)

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.

4

(Please insert your comments)

- “The results are well presented, clear, and contain no apparent errors.”
- “The findings are clearly articulated and accurately reported without detectable errors.”
- “The results are systematically presented and are free of reporting errors.”
- “The results are clearly presented and demonstrate accuracy with no evident errors in reporting.”

“The results for the year under review are clearly and systematically presented. They are well organized, logically structured, and easy to interpret. The findings demonstrate consistency with the study objectives and are reported accurately without evident errors or inconsistencies. Overall, the results section reflects clarity, coherence, and methodological rigor, enhancing the credibility and reliability of the study outcomes.

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.

3

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusion is generally well written and appropriately drawn from the study findings. It clearly summarizes the key issues affecting hospital management at Moramanga District Referral Hospital Centre (DRHC), particularly highlighting human resource shortages, infrastructural challenges, logistical constraints, and governance weaknesses. The linkage between the findings and the initial hypothesis is evident, and the conclusion logically reflects the evidence presented in the study.

However, while the conclusion is comprehensive, it is somewhat lengthy and could benefit from more concise synthesis of the main findings before presenting recommendations. In addition, the recommendations are broad and would be stronger if prioritized or linked more explicitly to the most critical findings. Overall, the conclusion is coherent, relevant, and

aligned with the study objectives, and it effectively emphasizes the need for improved hospital management systems to enhance service delivery and care quality.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The reference list is generally comprehensive and demonstrates wide coverage of relevant literature, including peer-reviewed journal articles, policy documents, government reports, and international organization publications. It appropriately integrates both global and Madagascar-specific sources, which strengthens the contextual relevance of the study. The inclusion of recent sources (up to 2025) shows up to date engagement with current health systems literature and policy developments. The references also reflect a good balance between empirical studies, institutional reports, and normative/legal frameworks, which is appropriate for a hospital management study. However, several issues require attention. There is inconsistency in formatting e.g use of spacing, capitalization, and punctuation across entries). Some entries appear duplicated in style but not fully harmonized to a single referencing format (such as APA). In addition, certain institutional and conference sources (e.g. Africa CDC and web-based sources) may require clearer retrieval details or standardized citation formatting for academic rigor. Overall, the reference list is rich, relevant, and current, but it needs careful editing to ensure full consistency with a recognized referencing style and to improve academic presentation quality.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Minor revision required

Comment on Overall Recommendation:

The manuscript presents a relevant and well-structured study with clear objectives, appropriate methodological orientation, and findings that contribute meaningfully to hospital management literature. The topic is timely and of practical significance, particularly in the context of strengthening health systems in resource-constrained settings.

However, while the study has strong merit, there are areas that require improvement, particularly in consistency of formatting, refinement of language in some sections, and standardization of

references. These issues do not fundamentally undermine the quality of the work but are important for enhancing academic rigor and presentation quality.

Recommended decision: *Accepted with minor revision needed.*

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript addresses an important issue in hospital management and provides relevant findings that contribute to understanding structural and organizational challenges in district referral hospitals. The study is generally well organized, and the conclusions are consistent with the results presented.

However, the author is encouraged to make the following improvements:

- Ensure consistency in referencing style and formatting throughout the document.
- Improve conciseness in the conclusion by reducing repetition and strengthening synthesis of key findings.
- Review language use to eliminate minor grammatical and typographical inconsistencies.
- Strengthen the alignment between recommendations and the most critical findings by prioritizing interventions.
- Standardize presentation of tables and results for improved clarity and readability.

Overall, the manuscript has strong academic potential and with minor revisions, it will meet publication standards.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

Yes, overall I agree. Based on the manuscript, the title is clear, concise, and consistent with the content.

It accurately reflects that the study evaluates hospital management in a specific district referral hospital in Moramanga, Madagascar

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

Yes. The abstract is well structured and clearly presents the study's background, objective, methodology, principal findings, and conclusions.

It provides an accurate summary of the manuscript and is consistent with the content of the article

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

The issues are generally minor rather than major, but they occur frequently.

1. The management of DRHCs in Madagascar..." → acceptable, but article use is sometimes inconsistent.

"The hospital management of the Moramanga DRHC" → Hospital management at the Moramanga DRHC sounds more natural.

2. The manuscript repeatedly begins paragraphs with phrases such as:

"The analysis showed..."

"The assessment revealed..."

"The study showed..."

This repetitive style reduces readability. Varying sentence openings would improve the flow.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are generally described and allow the reader to understand the overall design, setting, study population, data collection tools, and analytical approach.

However, the methodology lacks sufficient detail in several areas.

Specifically, the authors should provide more information on the sampling process, response rate, qualitative data collection and analysis, ethical approval, informed consent procedures, and the rationale for using only descriptive statistical analyses. Including these details would improve the transparency, reproducibility, and scientific rigor of the study.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

The results are generally presented in a clear and logical manner and are consistent with the study objectives.

However, the section would benefit from improved presentation, including additional tables and figures to summarize key findings.

Some results are repetitive, and several indicators require further explanation or contextual interpretation. While no obvious calculation or factual errors were identified, certain findings, such as the very low bed occupancy rate and the high budget execution rate, should be discussed in greater detail to facilitate interpretation.

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

The conclusion is generally accurate and supported by the findings presented in the manuscript. It summarizes the main results and provides practical recommendations that are consistent with the study objectives and outcomes.

However, the conclusion could be strengthened by emphasizing the key contributions of the study, acknowledging its limitations, and avoiding the introduction of broad statements that are not directly supported by the presented data.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes, it is comprehensive

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

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 RESULTS 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]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript addresses an important and relevant topic in hospital management within a resource-limited setting and provides valuable insights into the functioning of a District Referral Hospital Center in Madagascar. The use of the Donabedian framework offers a structured approach to evaluating hospital performance, and the findings have potential implications for

health policy and hospital management.

However, several aspects of the manuscript should be improved before publication. The Methods section requires additional detail regarding the sampling process, participant recruitment, ethical approval, qualitative data collection, and statistical analysis to ensure reproducibility. The Results section would benefit from the inclusion of summary tables and figures to improve readability and reduce the large amount of descriptive text. The Discussion should focus more on interpreting the findings rather than repeating the results and should better compare the findings with previous literature. Furthermore, the manuscript should include a dedicated section describing the study limitations, particularly the single-center design and the reliance on descriptive analyses.

From a language perspective, the manuscript is generally understandable but contains several minor grammatical and stylistic issues, including repetitive phrasing, awkward sentence structure, and inconsistent terminology. Careful English language editing by a native speaker or a professional editing service is recommended before publication.

Overall, the study is relevant and potentially suitable for publication after major revision. Addressing the methodological, presentation, and language issues will substantially improve the scientific quality and impact of the manuscript.
