



Paper: **“Indigenous Entrepreneurship and Economic Development: The Moderating Effect of Post-Conflict Reconstruction in Turkana County, Kenya”**

Corresponding Author: Wambui King’ong’o

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n19p520

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Moses Ikechukwu Okoli  
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria

Published: 31.07.2020

# *ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name:	
University/Country: Department of Cooperative Economics and Management, Faculty of Management sciences, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.	
Date Manuscript Received: 5th June, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 11th June, 2020
Manuscript Title: The Moderating Effect of Post-Conflict Reconstruction on the Relationship Between Indigenous Entrepreneurship Among Micro and Small Livestock Enterprises and Economic Development in Turkana County, Kenya	
<b>ESJ Manuscript Number: 0614/20</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i>
	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
The topic is vague and heavily worded with about 25 words. I suggest you adjust the topic with major variables in the topic to read thus: Indigenous Entrepreneurship and Economic Development: "The Moderating Effect of Post-Conflict Reconstruction in Turkana County, Kenya". I can understand that the study was carried out among Micro and Small	

Livestock Enterprises. This can be discussed or highlight in the background of study and methodology.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>The abstract is mixed-up:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. You cannot use stratified random sampling, simple random sampling techniques and purposive sampling to select four firms from the survey method for case studies at the same time (see the area I underlined in the abstract).</li> <li>ii. I cannot find where secondary data was used or tabulated in the body of the paper.</li> <li>iii. The sentences - Descriptive and inferential analyses were done. Analysis of variance (ANOVA), simple and multiple linear regression analyses were evaluated - are mere repetition.</li> <li>iv. The statement "Pilot was conducted and reliability and validity of the study instrument was evaluated" is misty.</li> <li>v. The sentences - Descriptive and inferential analyses were done. Analysis of variance (ANOVA), simple and multiple linear regression analyses were evaluated- are also repetitions.</li> </ol> <p>I suggest that you recast the area marked thus:  ... 598 livestock enterprises. <b>A sample of 339 micro and small livestock enterprises were selected for the study using simple random sampling techniques. Data collected were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics like mean, standard deviation, cumulative variance, Skewness, Kurtosis, ANOVA and regression analyses.</b> The results revealed ...</p>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
Grammatical errors were found mainly in the abstract and a few punctuations and spacing errors. I have highlighted some of the areas with red. The paper needs thorough editing.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
The tools used are appropriate but there is no clear mathematical and econometric models that explains the moderating effect of Post-Conflict Reconstruction	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
There are few errors in the body of the paper. In the first paragraph of page 12 after table 3, the statement highlighted with red- "economic development was regressed on indigenous entrepreneurship". should read "indigenous entrepreneurship was regressed on economic development" because economic development is a dependent variable in the study.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
The conclusions or summary are adequate. However, Conclusions, Recommendations and Suggestions for Further Research should be separated and itemized for clarity.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
The references are satisfactory	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Kindly look into the corrections and suggestions and effect them.

Your paper is rich in content.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:** Accept for publication after the corrections are done.