

Paper: “Moderating Effect of Illiquidity on The Relationship Between Momentum and Equity Returns in The Kenyan Capital Markets”

Submitted: 18 September 2021

Accepted: 23 December 2021

Published: 31 December 2021

Corresponding Author: Peter Kamau Ndichu

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n41p14](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n41p14)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Wesam Sharif Abu-Matar
Sindh University, Pakistan

Reviewer 2: Amir Mohammad Sohrabian
International Information Technology University (IITU), Kazakhstan

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: Wesam Sharif Abu-Matar | |
| University/Country: Sindh university /Pakistan | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 20/09/2021 | Date Review Report Submitted: 21/09/2021 |
| Manuscript Title: Moderating Effect of Illiquidity on The Relationship Between Momentum and Equity Returns in The Kenyan Capital Markets | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 1012/21 | |
| 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.

| <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. | 4 |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Manuscript title okay | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Abstract is generally okay, but some numbers and result should be added in the abstract | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> No notable grammatical and spelling errors in the document | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The methodology is well presented | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> No notable any errors, and it's clear | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> This section is generally okay | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Ensure that all references cited in the document are listed in the section of list of references | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

| | |
|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Accepted, no revision needed | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Accepted, minor revision needed | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Reject | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

More explanation should be given in the conclusion section

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

