

**Paper: “The Influence of Ownership Concentration on Firm Financial Decisions and Value: Evidence from Nairobi Securities Exchange”**

**Submitted: 12 November 2020**

**Accepted: 31 March 2021**

**Published: 30 September 2021**

Corresponding Author: Antony Mugambi

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n32p124](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n32p124)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Ojukwu, Henry Sonna  
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria

Reviewer 3: Nadia Mansour  
University of Sousse, Tunisia

# ***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: Ojukwu, Henry sonna	
University/Country: Nnamdi Azikiwe University / Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 27 <sup>th</sup> Nov. 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 3 <sup>rd</sup> Dec. 2020
Manuscript Title: The Influence of Ownership Concentration on Firm decisions and Value: Evidence from Nairobi Securities Exchange	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>There is need to shorten the abstract as it is too long and filled with information that ought not to be there.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Poor construction of tenses from the introduction to the research problem. There is need to work on the tenses. Improper use of space bar to clearly separate words. The conceptual framework diagram is empty as there are no wordings neither are there explanations to the developed diagram.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>There is need to be consistent with the meaning of abbreviation. Under the simple linear regression mathematical representation, FV was explained as Firm Performance, while it was later explained as Firm value under the multiple regression analysis mathematical representation.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>The value of skewness written below the descriptive statistics table does not correspond with the value in the table.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Poorly written conclusion and full of disjointed tenses. Needs to align it properly.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Well written and properly structured according ti APA Style.</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):**

The work is a good one aside for the need to effect the noted corrections.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

It will turn out to be a good empirical work especially for those researching in the area of finance. But, the corrections need to be effected accordingly.

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)*



yes very clear

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

they must add the limits and the horizons

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

(Please insert your comments)

-Spelling and grammar mistakes need to be corrected.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

the methodology is clear but the database is very outdated

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

\*

(Please insert your comments)

it contains several errors

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

\*

(Please insert your comments)

references should be added to the conclusion

**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)

It is necessary to update the bibliographical references, which are very outdated.

*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):**

Interesting article but suffers from several shortcomings:

- Spelling and grammar mistakes need to be corrected.
- The database needs to be updated, it's very outdated 2007
- It is necessary to update the bibliographical references, which are very outdated.
- The outline of the article should be added to the introduction.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**