



Paper: “Green Logistics Practices and Firm Performance: The Mediating Effect of Economic Performance Among Logistics Firms in Kenya”

Corresponding Author: Daniel Mutua

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n25p142

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Berényi László
University of Miskolc, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Alfred Bett
University of Kabianga, Kenya

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Published: 30.09.2020

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: Berényi László	
University/Country: University of Miskolc / Hungary	
Date Manuscript Received: 06.08.2020.	Date Review Report Submitted: 07.08.2020
Manuscript Title: GREEN LOGISTICS PRACTICES AND FIRM PERFORMANCE: THE MEDIATING EFFECT OF ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE AMONG LOGISTICS FIRMS IN KENYA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0861/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	

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>The title reflects the content, but a shorter one would be enough in further publications of the authors.</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The abstract includes all the necessary information.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are some typing mistakes (Ratnajeewa and Bartlett should be fixed in the text).</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The description of the methods is correct.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The conclusions are supported by the calculations, but it is a common weakness of the similar papers that the numerical results are not deeply analyzed. The applied solution is in harmony with publications using these methods; it is acceptable.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The authors use a broad literature base, references are correct.</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):

Do a technical review of the editing, line-spaces are varied. Replace the mistyped in-text citations.

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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: GREEN LOGISTICS PRACTICES AND FIRM PERFORMANCE: THE MEDIATING EFFECT OF ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE AMONG LOGISTICS FIRMS IN KENYA	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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: No	
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.	Yes
ok	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	Yes
<i>Edit as indicated</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	Yes
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	Yes
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	Minor
<i>Edit as indicated</i> <i>Literature review to present information regarding independent variable</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	Yes
<i>Okay</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	Yes
<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):

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: Alfred Bett	
University/Country: University of Kabianga - Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 07/08/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 11/08/2020
Manuscript Title: GREEN LOGISTICS PRACTICES AND FIRM PERFORMANCE: THE MEDIATING EFFECT OF ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE AMONG LOGISTICS FIRMS IN KENYA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0861/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The title is adequate to the content of the article as the interrelationship of the three	

<p>variables under study is clear and precise. These variables have been discussed adequately in the article.</p>	
<p>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Though the abstract is clear on the objects but there is need to reframe some sentences to make it more presentable. - On methods reliability and validity measurements used on the data collection instrument should be included. - The statistics (results) leading to conclusions should be presented. 	
<p>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>The grammatical errors and spelling mistakes throughout the article should be corrected to avoid distorting the otherwise good work.</p>	
<p>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In my view a brief justification of the research philosophy will be helpful. - The sample determination technique missing, there is need to indicate and justify the method used. - Data collection instrument reliability statistics and normality tests belongs to the methods section and not results as presented in the article. - Validity determination method should also form part of the methods. 	
<p>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>There are few grammatical errors that need to be corrected. For instance what is appearing as 1.8 Conclusion and Recommendations should just be recommendations since there a section already dealing with conclusions. Further the numbering 1.8 appearing should be corrected since it is the only section numbered. Lastly the manuscript should have page numbers for easier reference.</p>	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The discussions leading to conclusions and summary should be supported with statistics.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The references are suitable.	

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 are few corrections that should be made to improve the paper; otherwise the work is adequate for publication.
- Proof-reading to identify grammatical errors is highly recommended.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

None