

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_97604
Title of the Manuscript:	Assess and determine contribution of Knowledge Management as a Tool for Improving work Performance in selected law firms in Nairobi County, Kenya
Type of the Article	Original 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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with the 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>1. Knowledge and work performance is an Important multidisciplinary domain and an Interesting issue. Attempts to address this through this manuscript may take care the attention of the scientific community.</p> <p>2. The title states its suitability but needs redrafting and reframing to create an appropriate meaning.</p> <p>3.The abstract of the article comprehensive but need to incorporate well-defined objectives.</p> <p>4. The structure may be modified to develop the readability statistics.</p> <p>5. The manuscript will be scientifically correct only when the objectives and methodology will be correct. The rigour and rubrics of methodological applicability need to be ratified considering the contents and design of the study.</p> <p>6. References are not at all adequate to posit the problems, the research aims, objectives and methodology. For writing, critical appreciation of results needs to follow the triangulation which is lacking</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>94 general and 108 premium-level grammatical mistakes detected. Correction of these issues will enrich the manuscript and be relevance for readers and researchers.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Future implications and recommendations are lacking I this manuscript.</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:	Arup Barman
Department, University & Country	Assam University, India