

Review of: "Procurement Planning & the Rwanda Biomedical Centre (RBC)"

Godfred Otchere¹

¹ University of Otago

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The aims and research questions are clear and important to add new knowledge in Procurement Planning particularly for public institutions such as the Rwanda Biomedical Centre (RBC). However, few comments need to be addressed.

Background

1. Much of the text and literature in the Background section has been repeated (introduction and statement of problem).
Authors should reduce repetitions as much as possible.
2. Provide the source/author of the conceptual framework

Research Design and Method

1. Please explain and justify the number of interviews you conducted, including the process you used to guide your choices.
2. There is no information of the study area, RBC (for example which part of Rwanda or county).
3. For clarity and consistency, could authors explain the tool(s) they used for the qualitative method. Structured, unstructured, or semi-structured?
4. Would you be a wee bit specific on the research design. What specific reasons did you consider in choosing a mixed method for your study. It is unclear how the various objectives can be met by using the two approaches.
5. There is no analysis plan for both the qualitative and quantitative arm. Could authors explain which data analysis method and tools you used for your analysis. And how authors analyzed results from the two arms (qualitative and quantitative).
6. In general, the analysis is not sufficient enough to inform or make recommendations for future policymaking. Could you show a more rigorous analysis not only frequencies but descriptive and statistical associations and/or relationships between procurement planning and performance.
7. The ethical considerations and/or approval has not been shown in the paper.