

Manuscript: “**Effect of Green Manufacturing on Operational Performance of Manufacturing Firms in Mombasa County, Kenya**”

Submitted: 02 January 2021

Accepted: 22 June 2021

Published: 31 July 2021

Corresponding Author: Eric Mutie Musau

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n23p323

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Yasangi Anuradha Iddagoda
Chartered Institute of Personal Management, Sri Lanka

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: María Elena Rodríguez Benito
Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, Facultad de Comunicación

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 ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

-

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

(Please insert your comments)

-

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

-

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

-

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

-

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)

-

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):

Follow the fundamentals of writing an article. This looks like a copy and paste of a thesis.(2) Improve research design(3) Review more scholarly work(4) Review more recent scholarly works(5) Provide theoretical evidence in a constructive manner

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)

Yes, it is.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes

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

(Please insert your comments)

There are quite a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes, as well as a poor structure of paragraphs.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

There is only one hypothesis and I think the method is explained in a way that is too descriptive and redundant. I miss more insights.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes, it is

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes it is

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)

appropriate

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):

Congratulations on the article idea and study. I think the theme is interesting and your study appropriated, but to me, the feeling is that It is still a draft. You are missing hypothesis, insights, and further explanation of the study, as well as an in-depth grammar and spelling review.