

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_100533
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE-BASED COMPENSATION ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AT CHUKA LEVEL FIVE HOSPITAL IN THARAKA NITHI COUNTY, KENYA
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajebea.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partly. This is a topic of permanent relevance in the world's vast labour market but is not fully discussed in the article. 2. It is preferable to shorten the title, e.g, ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE-BASED COMPENSATION ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE or ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE-BASED COMPENSATION ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AT CHUKA LEVEL FIVE HOSPITAL 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4. Yes. 5. It lacks the depth to be called a scientific article. 6. It is common practice in the scientific community to refer to the original source of publication of the theory/technique/method and not to reprint. This has not been taken into account by the author(s) of the article, e.g. even when mentioning the Ability-Motivation-Opportunity (AMO) Theory, the reference is not to the author of the theory, but to the authors who have mentioned it in their publications. The reference list includes sources that are not referenced in the article, as well as references in the article that are not mentioned in the reference list. Reference list not properly formatted. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figure 1 is not clear. It is also not explained in the article. • It is advisable to be consistent in the introduction: if you are talking about Europe, write about Europe and the countries within it; if you are talking about Asia, write about Asia and Japan within it. This will make it easier to read and comprehend. • There is no consistency in the use of acronyms. Some acronyms are not explained, e.g. HRPs. • Perhaps the article would have benefited if the author/s had analysed different HRM theories and then settled on the AMO theory (which is also not a two-way street and has come under increasing criticism recently). • The abstract mentions that a pilot study was carried out, but this is not mentioned in the article afterward. • The methodology of the study does not reveal the process of the pilot study - time, the number of participants, results. The same is applicable to the study - when did it take place, how were the surveys (interviews) conducted? How was data protection ensured? • How many questions were in the survey/interview? The only thing the article discusses is the demographics of the respondents. It would have been interesting if the author(s) of the article had used this data in different correlation statistics, e.g. gender and the quality of the service performance, or education level and the quality of the service performance, or length of tenure and quality of work. Otherwise, it is data that was not really necessary to achieve the objective of the study. • The data in Table 3 can be interpreted in many different ways, including that respondents were not interested in thinking before answering. (Composite Mean 3.051). It is possible that they avoided extreme answers due to cultural context. • The research question is usually posed at the beginning of the study rather than in the conclusions. • Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation-Hygiene mentioned by the author(s) in the <i>Recommendation</i> section is not understandable. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">No consistency in the use of references.	
--	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sandra Iriste
Department, University & Country	Latvia University of Life Sciences and Technologies, Latvia