

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	Descriptive research 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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript is important for scientific community, as it shows the importance of innovations to improve the overall working of an organization, it opens the avenues for further research in the area. The results clearly shows that process re-engineering changes the performance of the NHIF.</p> <p>The title is suitable as it directly communicates the study.</p> <p>Yes it is.</p> <p>All the subsections and structure are appropriate, however there is a room for improvement, as introduction of the institution can be made more concised.</p> <p>Some of the references are missing. So few more can be added.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Overall the language is appropriate. There is sentence repetition at page no. 9 (last paragraph)</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>A good study worth publishing.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Reetu Tevatia
Department, University & Country	MIET, India