
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!

Date Manuscript Received: 23 Sep 2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 24 Sep 17
Manuscript Title: EFFECT OF BOARD SOCIAL CAPITAL ON INNOVATIVENESS IN THE BANKING INDUSTRY IN KENYA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 145.09.2017	

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. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Good and clear title.	4
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Relevant abstract and well written.	4
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> A few like: Avoid using I in abstract and page 1, put the researcher. 3.7.4 Dependent variables	4
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3.5

<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Ok but fewer techniques might work.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3.5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> See Section 3 above.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Yes, they do so.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Good references provided so far.	

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):

Good paper. I would suggest fewer and less complex models to use. References are okay. The definitions of certain elements like the types of tests need to be limited later. Good level of language and mastery. I commend the quality of this paper and its general good applicability to Nigeria.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Good paper, accepted for publication with few typing errors to be corrected.