

Paper: “Monitoring and Evaluation Practices and Performance of livelihood ventures: Focus; Nairobi youths conservation projects, Kenya”

Submitted: 25 September 2020

Accepted: 27 October 2020

Published: 30 November 2020

Corresponding Author: Wanjiru Nderitu

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n31p300](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n31p300)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Saverio Lovergine
University “Tor Vergata” of Rome, Italy

Reviewer 2: Vasilika Kume
Tirana University, Faculty of Economy, Albania

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: Saverio Lovergine	
University/Country: INAPP (Institute for Public policy innovation) /University “Tor Vergata” of Rome, ITALY	
Date Manuscript Received: 28/09/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 5/10/2020
Manuscript Title: Inducement on Monitoring and Evaluation Practices and Performance of livelihood ventures: Focus; Nairobi youths conservation projects, Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1040/20	
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 clear, but too long.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract is too long. In my opinion, an abstract should give the maximum of information with the minimum of word: They have written more than: Why did you undertake the research; What did you study and what methods did you use; The results you obtained; How you interpreted them.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Well done!</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>Good work!</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Strangely, the conclusions were too short, even if compensated by a good Recommendations.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The theme of the paper is very important because Monitoring and Evaluation practices are spurred by demand for project effectiveness, efficiency, transparency, accountability, information frameworks, quality, and availability of M & E technologies and instruments. Monitoring and evaluation is increasingly becoming an

essential program management tool too. According to Dyason (2010), Monitoring is the collection along with the analysis of information regarding a given program or intervention; and evaluation is an assessment whose focus is to answer questions relating to a program or an intervention. All these various definitions depict monitoring as an ongoing process mainly based on the set targets, planned activities in the course of the planning stage of work. Various agencies (The UN in particular) have established full-fledged M & E departments and legal or regulatory frameworks for regular M&E execution of projects that are donor funded on the backdrop of stringent regulations to achieve purposed socio economic development in target beneficiary communities.

The work is a good job (Analysis, method and methodology are well done); some parts need to reviewed (Title, abstract and conclusion). The format review is required.

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: VASILIKA KUME	
University/Country: Tirana University, Faculty of Economy,	
Date Manuscript Received: 10/10/20	Date Review Report Submitted: 12/10/20
Manuscript Title: Inducement on Monitoring and Evaluation Practices and Performance of livelihood ventures: Focus; Nairobi youths conservation projects, Kenya.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1040/20	
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.	3
<i>The title is too long and a little bit complicated. It is difficult to understand the aim of the study through title. Maybe, it is need to stress out in the title that the study aims the solid waste management projects.?</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The sentences, sometimes are not clear. In some sentences the idea is not clear or the verb is missing</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>May be any recent study will be appropriate to be used as reference</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Paper is well structured. Meets the conditions for publication. If the researchers would take care to correct some vague sentences and try to navigate to more contemporary literature, I think the study values would increase.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: