Paper: **"Project Management and Performance of Rural Road Construction Projects in Machakos County, Kenya"**

Corresponding Author: Cornelius Wandiri

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Uchenna Kingsley Anunne
School of Journalism and Communication, Xiamen University, China

Reviewer 2: Nishant Agrawal
Nirma University, India

Reviewer 3: Jihad Jami
Université Abdelmalek Essaâdi de Tanger Maroc

Reviewer 4: Blinded

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: Nishant Agrawal	Email:
University/Country: India	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 3rd June 2020

Manuscript Title: PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE OF RURAL ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS IN MACHAKOS COUNTY, KENYA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0514/20	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
Revise	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
Abstract is clear	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3

Yes remove all grammatical errors and spelling mistakes and improve language	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**
Improve representation of methodology	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**3**
Explain literature in detail	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**3**
Explain your result with existing study	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**2**
Add more reference from 2017 to 2020	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- Add more papers from 2016 to 2019 in the introduction section. It should be motivated for the reader and also add unique contribution.

- Address theoretical background of the study and also add theoretical implication (Support with theories). Draw conceptual model if possible

- Develop extensive literature review

- Develop the conclusions section to include the unique contributions of the paper, theoretical and managerial implications, limitations of the research and future research directions.

- Change name of "Summary" section to Discussion.

- References must follow the style of journal

- Support your work with existing work.