



Paper: “The Relationship between Corporate Governance, Financial Characteristics, Macroeconomic Factors and Performance of Firms Listed at the Nairobi Securities Exchange”

Corresponding Author: Moses Odhiambo Aluoch

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n19p169](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n19p169)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Robert K. Mule

Maseno University, Kenya, Department of Accounting and Finance

Reviewer 2: John Mukuna

Botswana Accountancy College, Botswana

Reviewer 3: Amir Mohammad Sohrabian

International Information Technology University (IITU), Kazakhstan

Published: 31.07.2020

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: Dr. Robert K. Mule	Email:
University/Country: Maseno University, Kenya, Department of Accounting and Finance	
Date Manuscript Received: 24 th June, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 29 th June, 2020
Manuscript Title: The Relationship between Corporate Governance, Financial Characteristics, Macroeconomic Factors and Performance of Firms Listed at the Nairobi Securities Exchange	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0604/20	
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>(It is a snapshot of the whole article and is supported by the content of the manuscript.)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

<i>(Most of the ingredients of an effective abstract are covered. However, the statistical results of each objective sought are not abstracted)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Some words are joined, see for example line 1 in the introduction section)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Check the inconsistency in the focus of the study under methodology section-The focus was all the listed firms yet the scholars are underscoring agricultural firms, Why?)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Requires minor editing Results need to be interpreted/given practical meaning as opposed to statistical meaning.)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Conclusions should be derived from interpreted results as opposed to raw results, e.g avoid the word significant..)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- There is need to interpret the results before drawing conclusions.
- Debunk the inconsistency in the methodology section where agricultural firms are given prominence.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Dr John Mukuna		
University/Country: Botswana Accountancy College (Botswana)		
Date Manuscript Received: 24 June 2020		Date Review Report Submitted: 25 June 2020
Manuscript Title: Corporate Governance, Financial Characteristics, Macroeconomic Factors and Performance of Firms Listed at the Nairobi Securities Exchange		
ESJ Manuscript Number: 04.06.2020		
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No		
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>All variables are well examined in the paper</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Yes. The abstract captures the objectives, key concepts, methodology and findings</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>Abstract second line from the bottom: ...and this the reason why.. (is missing after this)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Good</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>Problem statement: There are other studies on corporate governance and company performance in Kenya. Briefly make a clear point of departure in the problem statement much as this appears under literature review.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Good. Emphasis the distinctness and originality of the study especially from a NSE perspective</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Pages 2-3 on the NSE: Make reference to a report or other document by the NSE itself.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

As above

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: