



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_65185
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF STRATEGIC DETERMINANTS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF COUNTY ANNUAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS AMONG COUNTY GOVERNMENT IN KENYA. A CASE OF SELECTED KENYAN COUNTIES
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/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Abstract: “redesign their organizational cultures”. “Redesign” is a very strong term for organizational culture if we take the most widely used definition of unconscious patterns that underlie organizational behavior. I suggest to “analyze” or to “rethink” the organizational culture. Otherwise the word “redesign” must be justified with pertinent literature.</p> <p><b>METHODOLOGY</b></p> <p>-“A sample size of 229 was determined using Yamane's (1967)”. The bibliographic reference should appear in the “References”. For example: Yamane, Taro. (1967). Statistics: An Introductory Analysis, 2nd Edition, New York: Harper and Row.</p> <p>- “had worked with their County Governments for between one (1) and five (5) years while most of respondents, 36%, were aged between 41 and 50 years” one (1) and five (5) appear in Arabic numbers. Question: Why this procedure was not adopted in the continuity of the sentence ? I suggest you to homogenize the writing procedure. I think it will be better to remove the numbers placed in parentheses. This would avoid confusion because Arabic numbers in parentheses was also the way used to reference the publications.</p> <p>- A sample size of 229 was determined using Yamane's (1967) Question: What was the criteria used for the 229 retained sample to answer the survey questionnaire? I mean, besides the use of the Yamane's formula (the formula indicates the number), what was the criterion for the administration of the questionnaire to the person X and not to Y ?</p> <p>-The text does not inform how the questionnaires were administered. And this is a very important information especially so that we can understand the neutral result of most of the answers (next session)</p> <p>-“The questionnaire was pretested for validity using content analysis [20]. Reliability of the questionnaire was tested using internal consistency and specifically Cronbach alpha approach”. The Cronbach alpha index should have been mentioned in the text. As no data on the analysis of content or reliability has been provided, I suggest to supplement the information or removing this sentence.</p> <p><b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS</b> <b>Implementation of development plans in County Governments</b></p> <p>- “This means that county development plan implementation was moderate effective...” Most answers are neutral. This raises a problem as to the acuity of the scale or how it was administered or respondents would be afraid to provide their answers etc. How can we understand the neutral results? Does neutral results can be interpreted as moderate? Finally neutral answers raise many hypotheses that were not discussed in the paper.</p> <p>-The discussion of the results of the tables - especially Table 2: Implementation of development plans and Table 3: Analysis by effects of Strategic leadership characteristics - should be reviewed.For instance “The results in table 3 showed the most of the respondents 69(36.90%) indicated that Infusing ethical value systems very highly affects implementation of county annual development plans among the Kenyan Counties”. I cannot agree with this conclusion because the difference is very small between the positive (82 responses) and negative poles of the scale (87</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>people responded). The numbers need to be thought, interpreted... Another example in the Table 5: Analysis by organizational culture and implementation -“The results in table 5 show a majority of 101(54.01%) of the respondents indicating that teamwork culture <b>highly</b> (or high ?)</p> <p>Note: In descriptive statistics it is preferable to use terms such as the majority of the respondents, most respondents, few, part etc. reserving the words “highly” for the results coming from the statistical tests.</p> <p>-“[...] affected Kenya County Governments’ implementation of county annual development plans as 65(34.76%) showed that stability culture of having rules, autonomy, consistency and predictability at all <b>high</b> (?) affected..</p> <p>In the last case 65 <b>high</b> +50 <b>highly</b> =115 (50% of the sample. Is it high?). And later we will see that: “stability culture (p = .927) and risk-taking culture (p = 1.000) showed insignificant effect on timely implementation of annual county development”. How are contradictory results kept in the text without discussion?</p> <p>-Table 6</p> <p>“that responsibility and authority <b>lowly highly</b> [?] affected Kenya”</p> <p><b>CONCLUSIONS</b> - “although strategic leadership .. there are significant relationship” [Although strategic leadership... ] Please clarify the sentence.</p> <p>-“These are <b>between</b>; infusing ethical value systems and county programs budgets and procedures are immediately translated to action, developing human capital county programs, budgets and procedures are immediately translated to action, and <b>between</b> participative leadership and county programs, budgets and procedures are immediately translated to action”. Please clarify the sentence.</p> <p>-Thirdly; the study recommends that the counties should adopt particular organizational culture relevant to their environments. [...] “It is important to adopt a risk-taking culture which”...[...]. This concept of culture that can be “adopted” is highly questionable in the literature on the subject. Then the author’s point of view would need to be justified and defended with pertinent literature.</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>Key words: Instead of “Implementation of county annual development plans”, I suggest you: County Development Plan. Justification - It would be more synthetic and would encompass both plans cited in the paper: the Annual and also the County Integrated Development Plan. Instead of “<b>Strategic leadership characteristics</b>” please it would be better to put only “leadership”.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 3a line Instead of “ Id ” = Is</li> </ul> <p>id [??] essential for driving accomplishment of organisation’s development priorities. “Is” essential...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- before number 9. Instead of structures [“s”], it must be structure. So “an appropriate organizational structure must be in place to improve its success”. the country’s, constitution (2010) [ without the comma]. So “the country’s constitution (2010)”</li> <li>- Empirical studies including [7], [6]; [12]; [13], [14] and [15] have exposed certain variables as affecting the implementation of development plans.</li> </ul> <p>I see that using numbers in the text to indicate the references is usual in the literary of your scientific medium. However, I came from the human science then, please, allow me to say you (kindly with my apologies) that I find strange such a procedure. “ including [7], ...” I understand the author’s goal but “including a number” doesn’t make it very pleasant for the reader.</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Empirical studies ( [7], [6]; [12]; [13], [14] and [15] ) have exposed certain variables as affecting the implementation of... (all the numbers are placed in parentheses) OR</li> <li>b. Empirical studies mentioned below OR mentioned in the sequence</li> </ol> <p>“ [7] revealed a...” I rather the author’s name “as [6] found” .. I prefer the author’s name. So [ as Maina and Njagi (2019) found [... ] and so on ]</p> <p>METHODOLOGY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “The purpose of the descriptive research is to track, clarify and report aspects of a situation <u>as it naturally demonstrates the inclination for research.</u>” I suggest to clarify this part of the sentence.</li> <li>- “Using statistical package for Social Sciences (SPSS), this research <u>analysed</u> its data...” [analyzed]</li> </ul> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- On <u>admisntration</u> of 229 questionnaires [correction: “administration”] ...</li> <li>- “response being 81.66% was very <b>good</b> produce <b>good</b>, accurate and credible results” [good, good ?]</li> <li>- “Majority of the respondents, 61.2% , had worked” [ without the comma, remove space please]</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Congratulations for the work. This paper is synthetic in its theoretical part as expected for an empirical work. It presents an adequate methodological design, however the results need to be reviewed and, consequently, the conclusions of the work.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Doris Lieth Peçanha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of San Carlos, Brasil</b>