

Manuscript: “**Career Development And Performance Of Non-Family Employees In Selected Family-Owned Businesses In Kenya: West Kenya Sugar And Kirathimo Cereals**”

Submitted: 19 April 2021

Accepted: 04 May 2021

Published: 31 May 2021

Corresponding Author: Jedida Gathenge

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n15p239

Peer review:

Reviewer 1:Blinded

Reviewer 2: Dr. Jane Wanjira Njuguna, Kenyatta University, Kenya

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The title is Clea and adequate.	▲
	▼
◀	▶

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The abstract is clear and contains every eler

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

The paper does not contain grammatical err

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The used methodology is explained clearly.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The body of the paper is clear and understar

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusions are supported from the conl

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

All the references are cited correctly.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3

- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

the title is clear but there is consistent interch	▲
my suggestion is the title should incorporate	▼
◀	▶

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

the abstract provides clear object, methods a

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

the document is well written except for:
1. some sentences structures need to be re
2. there is consistent use of constructs inter

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

these are well explained.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

the body is clear but some sentences require

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

the summary is accurate but the conclusions

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3

- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

the document is well written but some of the s

