

Paper: “Influence of ICT integration on content preparation by ICT and Non-ICT trained teachers in secondary schools in Machakos County, Kenya”

Submitted: 02 September 2020

Accepted: 05 November 2020

Published: 30 November 2020

Corresponding Author: Rose Mwikali Kithungu

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n31p187](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n31p187)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Luan Bekteshi
"Barleti" University, Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 2: Asif Jamil
Gomal University, Pakistan

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: Luan Bekteshi	Email:
University/Country: "Barleti" University, Tirana, Albania	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Influence of ICT integration on content preparation by ICT and Non-ICT trained teachers in secondary schools in Machakos County, Kenya.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0978/20	
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.	

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Te title is clear and is adequate to the content of the article	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
There are some grammatical errors	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The study methods are explained clearly	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The references are comprehensive and appropriate	

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 a need for a little revision of the grammatical aspects.

The authors attempted to interpret their findings based on the reality of Machako County high schools in Kenya.
Other comments are reflected above.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: