

Manuscript: “**Sociocultural Determinants of Alcohol Abuse by Youths in Luanda Sub-county, Vihiga County, Kenya**”

Submitted: 19 February 2021

Accepted: 21 April 2021

Published: 30 April 2021

Corresponding Author: Maureen A. Winga

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n14p121

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Aurela Saliaj, University of Vlora, Albania

Reviewer 2: Tagba Péléï, Université de Lomé, Togo

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: 2-03-2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 12-03-2021
Manuscript Title: Sociocultural determinants of Alcohol Abuse by youths in Luanda Sub-county, Vihiga County, Kenya.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 10.03.2021	
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>The title is clear and represents clearly the article’s content.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract contains the entire necessary elements, although there aren’t divided into sections.</i>	
<i>The introduction part is too long. And maybe it would be better if there was a</i>	

<i>Conclusion statement as well.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>I have not noticed grammatical errors.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The study population and methods are explained clearly and with sufficient details. The results are elaborate with an reliable statistical analyses: bivariate and multivariate.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results' section is merged with the discussion's one, and I would prefer they were divided. Anyway, the prevalence of alcohol abuse and the socio-cultural factors that could possibly impact it are described with details and proper statistical analyses. These results are correctly compared with other studies in this field.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusions are clear and accurate.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are generally appropriate; also their APA format is comprehensive. However, it would be more proper if they were more updated (within last five years).</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):

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: TAGBA Péléli	
University/Country: Université de Lomé - Togo	
Date Manuscript Received: 05/03/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/03/2021
Manuscript Title: Sociocultural determinants of Alcohol Abuse by youths in Luanda Sub-county, Vihiga County, Kenya.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0310/21	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<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):

The scope of the study is too limited, it should be conducted with a more representative sample of the young population or at least in two regions of Kenya for a better comparison of the results and a normal extrapolation on the whole population of Kenya