

Manuscript: “**Drivers of Public Health Expenditure in Kenya: Do Structural Breaks Matter?**”

Submitted: 22 January 2021

Accepted: 22 June 2021

Published: 31 July 2021

Corresponding Author: Cyprian Amutabi

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n23p143

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Daniela Brevenikova
University of Economics, Slovakia

Reviewer 2: Janaka Jayawickrama
University of York, United Kingdom

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021*

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The title reflects the content and aim of the paper.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The abstract is clear and concise and presents objects, methods, and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

There are only mistakes in punctuation (replace a hyphen with a dash). Also, it is necessary to leave out an empty space after the end-of-sentence comma. Some words appear merged in my computer (no empty character between two or even three expressions).

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The study methods used in the paper are properly explained.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The body of the paper is clear, well-written, and does not contain errors. The paper contains interesting and relevant information arranged and discussed in a logical way.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The Conclusion is accurate; it meets the requirements placed on the research paper.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

The list of References is complete and contains all the sources cited in the body of the paper.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the *BODY* of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the *CONCLUSION* of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the *REFERENCES* of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The title make sense and explain what to expect in this paper.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The abstract is good and clearly presents objects, method, and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

Need some grammar and spelling check to ensure that there are no mistakes.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

It seems clear, however, I am not good with statistical models.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Other than the methods section, all the other sections are clear and easy to follow.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusion section is very clear and point towards answers to the question of the title of this paper.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

The reference list seems to be comprehensive and appropriate. Please double check in the final submission.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the *BODY* of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the *CONCLUSION* of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the *REFERENCES* of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This is a thought provoking paper with very interesting and useful thoughts and ideas. The author take a strong logical path to presenting this paper and there is a strong flow to the key arguments. In terms of the abstract, the author refer to a Big Four Agenda of the government, which cannot be found anywhere else in the paper. Please double check and make sure that the abstract clearly represent the contents of this paper. There are some typos and make sure to thoroughly edit the final submission.