



Paper: **“Investment Governance: Delegation Decision Antecedents by Insurance Companies in Kenya”**

Corresponding Author: Rogers Kinoti M’Ariba

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n13p286

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Raluca Dumache  
Victor Babes University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania

Published: 31.05.2020

# ***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: Raluca Dumache	
University/Country: Victor Babes University of Medicine and Pharmacy Romania	
Date Manuscript Received: 08.05.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 17.05.2020
Manuscript Title: <b>INVESTMENT GOVERNANCE: DELEGATION DECISION ANTECEDENTS BY INSURANCE COMPANIES IN KENYA</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 67.05.2020	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>A very good presentation with a suggested title</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and</b>	<b>5</b>

<b>results.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The whole manuscript is well written, described with its objectives, methods and results</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>No grammar errors</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>I wrote before the methods are well described</b>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Well presented, clear explanations</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Conclusions and summary are supported by the content</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>Yes, good references</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>X</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

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