

# Review of: "Understanding dis-functionalities in multi-agency policy collaborations in Kenya"

Wesley Teter

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for your hard work on this important topic. This article aims to explain how trust contributes to implementing a multi-agency approach to anti-corruption policies in Kenya. There is potential for an interesting article and valuable contribution to the literature. Based on this current version of the article, the author does not present a clear and convincing argument. Below are a few examples, which I hope are constructive and useful to keep this important work on track.

- There are many examples of complex ideas that could be simplified to help the reader. For example, this statement is too broad and hard to follow: "inter-institutional trust, in particular, can be understood within an interface between organisational culture, structure, and external environments of public organisations." In other words, does this mean that inter-institutional trust can be understood based on the setting of the public organization? There is little value in overcomplicating such a statement. It also doesn't help the reader understand what this means to anti-corruption policies in Kenya.
- Similarly, the analytical tools do not (yet) guide the reader through the context of Kenya's anti-corruption policies. For example, "rational-based tools for evaluating a multi-agency approach's performance must integrate mechanisms that may enhance effective participation in a collaborative implementation." How are we to understand this: 'a multi-agency approach's performance' or '*must* integrate mechanisms that *may*'?
- To help the reader, it would be useful to further streamline the literature review and focus on relevant 'dysfunctional dynamics in multi-agency relations'. This should include a simplified statement about how the author understands mutual trust, for example. There are many citations but little clarity about how this term is operationalized in the article.
- Currently, the draft would benefit from a more specific set of propositions and relevant data to examine. Substantial revisions should focus on a streamlined literature review and argument(s) to clearly explain and answer the research questions based on the interview data and findings. There is clearly important work here that helps to explain and overcome 'inward-looking implementation strategies' in a unique and promising analysis. Good luck!