



Paper: “Social-Cultural Environment and Performance of Donor Funded Health Projects in Kenya”

Corresponding Author: Jones Ong'era Mobegi

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n19p558

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Sayeeduzzafar Qazi
University of Business & Technology, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

Reviewer 2: Nirmal Kumar Betchoo
University of Mascareignes, Mauritius

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: Dr Nirmal Kumar BETCHOO	
University/Country: Université des Mascareignes, MAURITIUS	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 22/05/2020
Manuscript Title: SOCIAL-CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT AND PERFORMANCE OF DONOR FUNDED HEALTH PROJECTS IN KENYA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0595/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. <i>Clear title which is a bit lengthy but where the central idea is okay. A full stop needs to be removed from the title.</i>	4
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	4

results.	
<i>It is a bit general compared to the results obtained in the study.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>It is well written. The level of English language is suitable for a research paper.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>A regression method has been used and values are adequately included to illustrate how they influence the model.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>I found it okay in general. There is no major error seen.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3.5
<i>Compared to the body of the paper regarding methodology and techniques worked out, the conclusions and recommendations look a bit short. May be they could support the figures obtained in the research.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>No problem with regards to referencing.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X-remove full stop in title.
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

A well worked out paper on donor institutions and funding of projects in Kenya. A suitable model has been used. Common to many countries, corruption remains a major determinant but there could be alternately a mechanism of transparency acting as a whistle-blower. A fine paper that can give way to more research like the link between transparency, good governance and corruption within donor country and benefactor, in this case, Kenya.