

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting   |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJEBA_100587   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | ANALYSIS OF PROCESS RE-ENGINEERING ON ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE OF NHIF IN NORTHERN REGION, 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> )

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p>1. The manuscript can be strengthened by more backing by Literature. Many paragraphs are needing more support from literature. Variables and their relation needs better establishment. Use of word census is confusing. Sample size is very small for a quantitative research. More sophisticated technique can be utilized with better sample size.</p> <p>2. Title seems fine.</p> <p>3. Abstract written needs modification as it should talk about objectives and their achievements rather than methodology in elaborated form.</p> <p>4. Needs improvement</p> <p>5. Not upto the mark</p> <p>6. More literature is needed hence reference will increase.</p> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>   | ok  |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  |   |   |

### PART 2:

|  | 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> |   |

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | <b>Prashant Trivedi</b>                                      |
| Department, University & Country | <b>School of Business Management, CSJM University, India</b> |