
ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend 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:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 30 th April, 2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title: FACTORS INFLUENCING STRATEGIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS IMPLEMENTATION IN GOVERNMENT PARASTATALS: A CASE OF KENYA FOREST SERVICE, MAU FOREST CONSERVANCY	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 581/16(2)	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4.5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references are ok</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The document is good in form and content. The following corrections are recommended

- (1) Remove one full stop at the end of 2nd paragraph of the introduction section**
- (2) Heading for Table 2 is not conclusive; review**
- (3) Table 5 should be table 4 because there is no Table 4. The subsequent tables should be adjusted accordingly in terms of numbering. The narrations in the body should then reflect the revised numbering**
- (4) The conclusions incorporate findings which have already been considered in the results and discussions section. These sections should be sharpened so**

that conclusions are presented precisely based on the findings without re-representing the findings.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Recommended for publication subject to amendments

