ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018*

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 report. 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. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper.
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: July/25/2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: July/30/2018
Manuscript Title: An empirical analysis on the effect of poverty on health care utilization in Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 110.07.2018	

Evaluation Criteria:

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

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
(a brief explanation is recommendable) **There are many other variables included in the analysis. Perhaps the authors should include in the title "poverty and other factors."**	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**
(An explanation is recommendable)	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
(a brief explanation is recommendable) **Use "depend_e_nt" variable instead of depend_a_nt. (Table 3 and Appendix A1)**	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
(An explanation is recommendable)	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**5**

(An explanation is recommendable)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
(An explanation is recommendable) **Authors should include the results regarding the rest of the "predictors variables" included in the analysis.**	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style. *(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)*	**4**
(a brief explanation is recommendable) **Verify that all tables are constructed using the latest edition of APA format.**	

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):

See comments in the "Evaluation Criteria" table.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: