

Paper: “Financing MSMEs Green Growth, Resource Efficiency and Cleaner Production in East Africa”

Submitted: 04 November 2020

Accepted: 25 December 2020

Published: 31 January 2021

Corresponding Author: Nebert Mandala

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n1p196](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n1p196)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Caren B. Angima
University of Nairobi, Kenya

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: 30.11.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 6.12.2020
Manuscript Title: FINANCING GREEN GROWTH, RESOURCE EFFICIENCY AND CLEANER PRODUCTION IN EAST AFRICA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 11123/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: NO	
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

The word SMEs should be added in the title (i.e. between financing and green) or before the word East Africa since the context of the study is on these SME enterprises.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
Include the word ‘ financing ’ as a key word as this is really what the study is primarily about	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
Proof read to correct the few that were noted e.g reference to the correct figure(s) when presenting results.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
It would be desirable to reword the main (overall) objective in a manner that encompasses the specific objectives. As currently worded, it just restates one of the specific objectives	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Including the response rate (a breakdown of the number of firms/enterprises from each country that were considered /participated in the survey) would add value for purposes of confirming that the survey indeed covered the countries stated in the study.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
Most sources referred to in the document are not included in the references. An attempt to include them is recommended, especially for the studies being reviewed that cover the same concepts.	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It is desirable if reference to self by authors (such as we, ouretc)is avoided but instead attribute the narration and findings to the study.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: