

Manuscript: **“The Effect of Church Conflict on the Growth of Pentecostal Churches in Kenya: A Case Study of Selected Churches in Nairobi”**

**Submitted: 02 April 2021**

**Accepted: 11 May 2021**

**Published: 31 May 2021**

Corresponding Author: John Miatu Thiga

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n16p22

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Richard Mutura, Pan Africa Christian University, Kenya

**Reviewer 2:** Dr. Tayeb Boutbouqalt, UAE/Morocco

**Reviewer 3:** Dr. Stephen Kapinde, Pwani University

**Reviewer 4:** Prof. Dr. Nertila Ljarja, University of Shkoder “Luigj Gurakuqi”, Shkoder, Albania

# ***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:	
Date Manuscript Received: 21/04/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/04/2021
Manuscript Title: <b>The Effect of Church Conflict on the Growth of Pentecostal Churches in Kenya: A Case Study of Selected Churches in Nairobi</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0451/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No 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>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title captures the variables.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The abstract is fairly well written. Largely all the objects, are spelt out. The results analysis need to be revised and also include the findings and discussion in the abstract.</b>	
<b>The is lack of clarity on the correlations being sought between conflict and church growth. This is evident in the abstract and in the entire paper</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>There are a couple of grammatical errors in the paper. I would suggest the paper be taken to an editor before publication.</b>	
Adhere to accurate referencing and punctuation. For instance we have, Olson (2008) and (Olson 2008) in the paper. Which one is which? Need to rework the referencing style strictly in the entire paper	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The methods are identified and explained. Data collection instruments are not spelt out crisply.</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>The findings are clear but there is need to augment how they inform the discussion and recommendation</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>There is no conclusion though there is discussion and recommendation. I would appreciate if the two are heavy on the content of the research since this is largely the contribution of the researcher to scholarship.</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>They are adequate for this type of work</i>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

1. There is a need for the author to control the writing to achieve the aims of the paper. There is a silence in the correlation between conflict and church growth throughout the paper. It will help if the author comes out clearly if he is blaming conflict for lack of growth among the studied Pentecostal churches or if he is praising conflict for propagation of Pentecostal churches.
2. Rework your background of study to align with the title, abstract and the statement of problem and the objectives of study. This is to create a better appeal in your paper.
3. In your discussion and analysis of results, it may help if you organized it in a way that follows your objectives of study. Seek to attain a fair balance of the three objectives.
4. That will help him draw conclusions that can apply universally among Pentecostal churches, which is the contribution you hope to make to scholarship.
5. Some of the assumptions made need some further investigation. One of those that is evident in the paper is an apparent decline in Pentecostal churches in Africa. For this to be sustained, the author needs to quote authoritative studies that state so.
6. Since this is a paper, you can organize your headings and subheadings to serve your argumentation. Some can be combined and others can be left out for ease of reading.
7. Use your findings to enhance your discussion. You do not need to quote other scholars in your discussion except when it is absolutely necessary. Make a case given your findings.

# ***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: <b><i>Dr. Tayeb BOUTBOUQALT</i></b>	
University/Country: <b><i>UAE/Morocco</i></b>	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b><i>The Effect of Church Conflict on the Growth of Pentecostal Churches in Kenya: A Case Study of Selected Churches in Nairobi</i></b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b><i>Yes/No</i></b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b><i>Yes/No</i></b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b><i>Yes/No</i></b>	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

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

<b><i>Questions</i></b>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<b><i>The title is adequate to the content of this case study</i></b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b><i>Very good</i></b>	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Spelling and grammar rules are compliant enough</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The study methods are clearly explained</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Good overall</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Good overall</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Good enough</i>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>X</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

# ***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: Prof.Dr, Nerila Ljarja	
University/Country: University of Shjkodra “Luigj Gurakuqi”, Shkoder, Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: 16.04.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 01.05.2021
Manuscript Title: <i>The Effect of Church Conflict on the Growth of Pentecostal Churches in Kenya: A Case Study of Selected Churches in Nairobi</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0451/21	
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.**

<b><i>Questions</i></b>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Yes, the title of the article is pretty clear, it clearly represents what is expected in the article.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The abstract presents clearly the objective of the study, the nature of Pentecostal churches conflict in Kenya. It presents methods based on a data collected from</i>	

<i>participants' subjective experience and on the selection of the church leaders in influential positions. The result presented in the abstract comes in the form of recommendations to avoid conflicts by practicing inclusivity.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Based on my thoughts, the article contains no grammatical or spelling errors.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The method used in the study is made clear to the reader. The description of the method is presented in separate paragraphs, explaining how the phenomenon was studied, how the data were extracted and how the result of the study could be obtained. The effect of the conflict is presented by later analyzing the data presented in the tables and the description of membership.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The result of the study is clear. The author tries to give the dimensions and reasons for the increase of the conflict, but also to confirm the accuracy of his conclusions with data taken from studies of the same field.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The conclusions of the study arrive in the form of recommendations, which come naturally after the presentation of the facts submitted in the study. These recommendations of the article are addressed to church leaders and technique to stop the conflict.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The references are based on a rich literature and on more specific titles of this fields of study.</i>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>X</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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