

Manuscript: **“The Prevalence, Causes And Effects Of Drug Use And Abuse On Performance Indicators Among Secondary School Students In Teso South Constituency, Kenya”**

Submitted: 25 January 2021

Accepted: 03 March 2021

Published: 31 May 2021

Corresponding Author: Winga Maureen Adhiambo

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n15p111

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Olena Kovalchuk, Dnipropetrovsk State University of Internal Affairs, Ukraine

Reviewer 2: Dr. N. K. Rathee, Delaware State University, USA

Reviewer 3: Ana María Florez, Universidad Latina de Panama, Panama

Reviewer 4: Brilanda Lumanaj, University of Shkoder “Luigj Gurakuqi”, Shkoder, Albania

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Olena Kovalchuk	
University/Country: Dnipropetrovsk State University of Internal Affairs, Ukraine	
Date Manuscript Received: 13.02.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 19.02.2021
Manuscript Title: The Prevalence, Causes and Effects of Drug Use and Abuse on Performance Indicators Among Secondary School Students in Teso South, Constituency, Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0223/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments) The title is quite clear</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The objectives of the research are well-structured. It is not clear what questionnaire was used. Who are the authors?	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The paper is well-written in terms of grammar	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>It is not clear how the researchers check their questionnaire for validity and Reliability of instruments. Did the authors create the questionnaire themselves?</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The results correspond with the paper objectives. They are quite clear.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusions and summary are accurate and supported by the content. The results are discussed.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The references are comprehensive and appropriate, there are 23 references.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It would be better to add the example of the questionnaire to have an idea what factors it focus on.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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. N. K. Rathee	Email: nrathee@desu.edu
University/Country: Delaware State University, USA	
Date Manuscript Received: Feb. 12, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: Feb, 20, 2021
Manuscript Title: The Prevalence, Causes and Effects of Drug Use and Abuse on Performance Indicators Among Secondary School Students in Teso South, Constituency, Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0223/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
The title of the paper is very appropriate	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
Yes, the abstract provides the brief description of the full paper.	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
No, there aren't any grammatical errors worth noting.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
Methodology serves the paper very well.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The result Analysis meets the requirements generally set for a research paper	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
Conclusions & recommendations have been provided in the paper	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
References are complete.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):