

Paper: “The Demand and Effects of Accountability and Efficient Utilization of Resources by Donors of Local NonGovernmental Organisations (NGOS): A Qualitative Assessment of Some Selected NGOS in the Central Region of Ghana”

Submitted: 01 September 2021

Accepted: 13 September 2021

Published: 30 September 2021

Corresponding Author: Emmanuel Abeku Essel

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n32p21

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Cavens Kithinji
Pan Africa Christian University, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Isaac Ogundu
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rumuolumeni, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

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 is quite long, but t accurately reflects the goals and the content of the paper. I can accept it.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The abstract meets the requirements; it gives an overview of the paper. It is ready to raise the attention of the readers.

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

(Please insert your comments)

The text is readable, it is easy to follow the author's line of thought. Nevertheless, a grammar check is necessary; there are some problems. I suggest using at least a grammar check software (beyond the built-in Word solution) that shows conjugation, US-British, and other issues.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The methods are clear and acceptable in line with the goals and the results.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

The body of the paper is acceptable, readable. The case studies give valuable information. The manuscript shows that the author is a PhD student. What is described is presumably related to the doctoral research of the author. The thorough literature review and the results can be well extended in finalizing the theses.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusion is acceptable. It is a good summary and outlook.

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 references are correct. Please, check the format and in-text references in some former papers. Personally, I suggest using 'et al.' form in the case of three or more authors in the body of the paper. However, the present format is also scientific. ESJ template is available; use it for the final formatting 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):

The manuscript is a valuable contribution to its field and the doctoral progress of the author. I can recommend the publication after a grammar check and formatting. Using the template of the journal is important in several ways, use it! I consider this as a minor but very important task.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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 could be improved by including a second variable to it. What are these accountability demands doing to the operations of the NGOs? This would direct arguments in the main paper and give the same better clarity. Remember the title needs to be clear enough to help you focus your arguments.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.*

(Please insert your comments)

This section introduces a variable on efficient resource utilization. However, this is not reflected in the findings part of the same. The abstract should include some of the demands established in the findings. The keywords should be revised to include accounting modes and other relevant terms.

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

(Please insert your comments)

There are a few issues of sentence structures that could be revised to improve understanding of the content.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.*

(Please insert your comments)

The rationale to sample only two organizations and 10 respondents need to be clear. What were the documents that were targeted for review and why? This is not indicated. What documents from the organizations were to be reviewed to show the demand for accountability?

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

(Please insert your comments)

There is a general need for the writer to develop the flow of the paper in a logical manner. There was an attempt to organize the section into subtitles but they have not brought out clearly the demands that are seen in the organizations. For example, what do the beneficiaries demand in terms of accountability? what are the demand of government agencies? We are not able to point them out straight from the paper. There is a need to establish linkages in the arguments done to the variables of the study.

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

(Please insert your comments)

This needs to be a summary of the accountability demands and the effects of these demands on the efficiency and general performance of the organizations (Avariable that was introduced at some point). .

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)

This is structured okay. Please check to see none is missing. eg. Boelhe, 2010;

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):

Please follow the comments on the paper to improve your work. The suggestions are well-considered, especially the need to include a second variable and establish linkages.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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!

Reviewer Name: PROF. ISAAC OGUNDU	
University/Country: NIGERIA	
Date Manuscript Received:13/09/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 17/09/2021
Manuscript Title: THE DEMAND OF ACCOUNTABILITY BY DONORS OF LOCAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS:A QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF SOME SELECTED NGO'S IN THE CENTRAL REGION OF GHANA.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 14631-TRANSCRIPTS-42607 -1-4-20210831	
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.	3
<i>(Re- cast to avoid repetition of NGO'S</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Add more details of findings</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>I agree</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>I agree</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>I agree</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>I agree</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>I agree</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):A good job, but pay attention to areas indicated above

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: ensure appropriate corrections are made.