



Paper: “Progressivity of the Output Based Aid Voucher Programme and its Effects on Family Planning and Maternal Health in Nairobi and Kiambu Counties, Kenya”

Corresponding Author: Isaac Odeyovwi Ogo

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n25p175](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n25p175)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Noor Alam
Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia

Reviewer 2: Aurela Saliaj
University of Vlora, Albania

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 14-08-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 22-08-2020
Manuscript Title: Progressivity of the Output Based Aid Voucher Programme and its Effects on Family Planning and Maternal Health in Nairobi and Kiambu Counties, Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 87.08.20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No 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.	04
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	01
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	03
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	04
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	02
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	03
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	04
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

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): Not properly structured, especially Abstract and Introduction. Literature Review as a separate section does not exist.
Conclusion also needs more elaboration.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: