

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_80952
Title of the Manuscript:	INFLUENCE OF LEADERSHIP STYLES ON QUALITY HEALTH SERVICE DELIVERY AT MNAZI MMOJA HOSPITAL ZANZIBAR
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>)

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	<p>I would sincerely recommend the authors to do thorough proof reading of the entire article, to improve the readability or get a professional to help edit the entire manuscript. I also recommend the authors to use a free online software for editing English language (www.grammarly.com). There are numerous typos, wrong tense usage, missing articles which strongly compromise the essence of the article. Some of the omissions in your write up diminish the meaning of your sentences, try as much as you can to improve this by proof reading. I have added some comments in the manuscript which can guide the authors on how to improve the manuscript</p> <p>The authors should be consistent with your style of citation. Try to follow the Journal's recommended way of formatting citations and references or use bibliography formatting software like endnote, to help improve your manuscript In addition, learn to always give a context for your citations for example on page 4 section 1.5.2 (Empirical literature review), it would be great to say; A study carried out by Sagaren and colleagues focused on a comprehensive understanding of the challenges (Sagaren et al., 2018)</p> <p>The tone used to write this manuscript is very casual. For instance On page 2 paragraph 2 that begins with "In the current evolving health service environment.....", what do you mean by disturbing, this should written in a coherent manner to enable the reader gain interest in your write up. You need to beef up your sentences throughout the manuscript other than leaving your texts hanging.</p> <p>There is too much information especially in the introduction and literature review, please find a way of compressing them to make the readership interesting. I literally find this piece of work lacking a lot in terms of coherency and readability. There is a lot of unnecessary words used in the write up which confuse the reader. For purposes of improving the manuscript, the authors should labor to proofread word for word and delete the unnecessary sentences. Ensuring sentence interconnectedness and coherency are key in enhancing readability</p> <p>On the objectives section 1.3 I recommend the authors to combine the three objectives into just one main objective: To assess the influence of transformational, transactional and democratic leadership styles on quality health service delivery at MnaziMmoja Hospital and include this in the abstract</p> <p>On page 4 section 1.5.2 (Empirical literature review), on the following paragraph</p> <p><i>"On the other hand the current study used quantitative methods and data was analysed using SPSS. The previous study used mixed-method research approach and data was analyzed using the Nvivo computer software. Further the study was done in South Africa unlike the current one was done in Zanzibar".</i> I don't think using SPSS and NVivo are reasons enough to enhance your comparison, please remove it and the authors should go ahead and explain various factors that differentiate Zanzibar from SouthAfrica, why is it a reason of distinction yet these are all in the seemingly same region (Africa)</p> <p>Ethics Approval.</p>	All the necessary corrections were done as indicated

Review Form 1.6

	<p>The authors MUST provide a statement that this study obtained Ethical approval from the relevant authorities and be sure to include the protocol number</p> <p>Results section</p> <p>About the information written in result tables, be careful not to repeat the information that has already been listed in the table.</p> <p>I would reserve the interpretations in the results section for the discussion section. During the results section you only present results</p> <p>Discussion section</p> <p>Structure your discussion by summarizing the main findings and what do they mean as far as your study is all about, what do other researchers say about your findings/ which other researchers have similar findings and how do your findings differ from the previous research carried out. The discussion should be entirely centered on your main findings.</p> <p>Remember to Discuss the strength and Limitations of your study and the implication of your research to future researchers and policy makers i.e what should the policy makers bear in mind as far as far as your findings are concerned.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	In the results section the authors wrote the word mangers instead of managers multiple times which I believe needs to be sorted.	
Optional/General comments		

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	