

---

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend as part of the revision.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial teamis a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received:02/07/2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:03/07/2016
Manuscript Title: COMPETITIVE INTELLIGENCE PRACTICES AND PERFORMANCE OF FIRMS LISTED ON THE NAIROBI SECURITIES EXCHANGE, KENYA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0707/16	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-lesspoint rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

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

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

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

Paper is good and relevant in contributing to knowledge in strategic management. Authors can improve its quality by:

- enhancing organization and structure so that ideas flow more logically. All Subtopics should be clear and numbered. Hypotheses can be presented after literature review. Authors should consider including the conceptual framework to accompany the hypotheses. In the methodology section, include a section for data analysis and present the empirical model under the section. Merge the tables presenting the regression results.
- strengthen the problem statement by highlighting the theoretical gap
- enhancing the literature review by anchoring the discussions on the relevant set of theories that underpin the phenomenon being investigated.
- strengthening the discussion on the findings by highlighting the theoretical implications of the current findings.

## Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

- Consider the paper for publication after the minor issues raised have been addressed

