



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_29341
Title of the Manuscript:	Nexus among Leadership Styles, Strategy Implementation and Performance of Small and Medium Manufacturing Firms in Thika, 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	A) The paper needs a structural revision. At present it is much like in the form of a thesis. I suggest the author should have only two Sections in the paper before the Methodology i.e. Introduction part and Literature part. The introduction section can include the contents of 1. 1 - 1.5. While the literature and theory part can subsume 2, 3 4.1, and 4.2. Methodology part is by and large good, I would suggest the author to concise the articulation The Discussion part is poor and needs to be elaborated, if possible comparative analysis with similar study should be made based on the results. Again, implications of the study and pros and cons of the results are not drawn in the discussion section. Recommendation and conclusions should be merged together and be stated clearly based on the objective and results of the paper – in the present form it is convoluted B) Needs to avoid/omit repetitive statements, ideas, and concepts. The author repeatedly mentioned/explained 'strategy implementation process'. I believe, an idea in a paper should be introduced once and then arguments/ counter-arguments can follow it. C) There are statements that does not fit in the initial Introduction and Literature/Theory sections. For example, line 48-56 is completely	a) i) Yes it is from a thesis but thesis appearance in the entire paper has now been minimised. ii) The entire paper's structure has been revised to accommodate the reviewer's observations and to detach it from a thesis format. iii) The two sections suggested have been merged in this paper. Information in the suggested sections moved to the relevant sections. iv) Methodology revised and made concise and clear. v) Discussion part is now more elaborate with



SDI Review Form 1.6

	misfit. This para should go in Conclusions or Discussion section. D) Excess research questions, and objectives. Ideally, paper should have one or two objectives. The author should nail down his objectives to two. Similarly, he/she should narrow down the set of research questions. Since objectives and research questions are complementary the author can have one of those rather than the both. E) Excess Theories. General Systems Theory is a wonderful Framework to capture any complex phenomenon or case. However, in this paper I believe the Dynamic Capability View has the potential to encapsulate all the components the author wishes to delve out theoretically – meaning systems theory is redundant one. Besides, none of the conceptual framework, results, and discussion has retrospective narrative based on the systems theory. FINALLY, overall I strongly believe that if the paper deals with a single independent variable i.e. Leadership style in relation to Firms Performance – the Paper will be more focused and concise, and will draw attention of the prospective audience. Therefore, I suggest dropping the 'Strategy Implementation' component from the paper. Besides, there is not much discussion or results in the paper as regards strategy implementation. I guess the author convoluted leadership and strategy in relation to SME performance. Please clarify this issue: Many a times I found not enough paraphrasing of other authors statements. The author should pay attention to the fact that if the original form of the other authors statement is placed in the text then he should use quote/unquote and specify source page number.	comparative studies introduced in line with the study objectives. vi) Recommendation and conclusions parts have been merged. b) Repetitive statements, concepts and ideas taken care off in the entire manuscript c) The suggested misfits have been eliminated. d) The purpose statement has been taken to the introduction part. Objectives and research questions reduced to two. e) The GST theory has been dropped and DCV used instead to underpin the variables under investigation. However, DCV, just like RBV, is just a proposed framework not yet a full theory. f) Yes, Leadership style is convoluted with strategy implementation since the dividing line between the two is very thin.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

		However, Leadership and performance has now taken precedence in the entire paper. <u>Clarification</u> Yes, I agree that there may be some instances of paraphrased sentences in this paper But the APA requirements have not been violated since all authors works have been cited and acknowledged. Quotations and page numbers has been introduced where necessary.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The paper is verbose – with unnecessary words and long and complex sentences. There are many grammatical and syntax related issues – which should be fixed by a professional language editor. The presentation style of the results is poor – the author should have some charts and graphs rather than plain tables all along.	The current paper is now more precise. Long and repeated sentences have been revised in the entire manuscript. An extra figure has been introduced to break the monotony of tables
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I would suggest exclude Table 1 and 2 from texts (put these as annex, if necessary) and take the excerpts from these to address your objectives.	Table 1 and 2 has been taken to the annex pages and the information contained in them has been used to address the objectives as suggested by the reviewer.