

Manuscript: “**Monitoring and Evaluation Practices and Performance of County Maternal Health Programmes**”

Submitted: 28 August 2021

Accepted: 08 October 2021

Published: 31 October 2021

Corresponding Author: Charles Ngatia

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n37p39](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n37p39)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Wanjiru Nderitu

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: 13 th Sep 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 18 th /Sep/ 2021
Manuscript Title: <i>MONITORING AND EVALUATION PRACTICES AS A PRE-REQUISITE FOR COUNTY MATERNAL HEALTH PROGRAMMES PERFORMANCE</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 36.09.2021	
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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.	3
<i>(The title need to be amended to reflect the context of the study as guided)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(The study has no objectives defined; the abstract is comprehensive but lacks the introduction of the objectives that resonates to findings therein. The target</i>	

<p><i>population is not also well defined from the abstract. The methodology covers a whole study of four components of the Independent variable which is M&E practices but has disconnected with the descriptive statistical analysis which is missing; including the results of the other techniques described in the methodology). The formulation of the hypothesis has been rectified in the comments to imply the context of the study.</i></p> <p><i>The author therefore needs to revamp the entire section as guided. The manuscript also does not follow the ESJ format; enough sections are missing and others lack the flow.</i></p>	
<p>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><i>(There are grammatical errors in this manuscript. The literature reviewed is unnecessarily detailed without a clear connection to the four components of the Independent Variable. The author has also used a lot of undefined acronyms)</i></p>	
<p>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p><i>(The study methodology is not well explained since the study is a combined variable comprising of four components (Objectives); hence no clear indicative explanation of whether the author used factor analysis to create indices for each construct or combined the four constructs from the inferential statistics to deduce the findings.)</i></p>	
<p>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p><i>(The author need to revise the analysis indicatively and statistically)</i></p>	
<p>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p><i>(Revise accordingly as guided; on the conclusion after amending the inferential statistics)</i></p>	
<p>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><i>(Use APA; ESJ format)</i></p>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The author ought to follow the ESJ format; the Manuscript is too detailed and jumbled up without a clear flow of the study from the topic to the findings. The Author has gaps on essential sections of an article which they need to include. The literature review section and the County Maternal status ought to be embedded to the scope of the study and the content of the study variables; which are the components of the Independent variable of the study. The statement of the problem too is not persuasive as an area of concern or a gap in the existing knowledge that points to the need for

further understanding and investigation; given that Monitoring and Evaluation is currently gaining popularity in Kenya and Africa as a whole. However, even with the governments good will; many social programs like Health are still not informed by real time data, neither is monitoring and evaluation institutionalized within the ministries and other state agencies as a tool for management and government; to link up performance to SDGs, Africa Vision 20163; Kenya Vision 2030 and finally cascade down ward to County Integrated development Plans (CIDP). Health is devolved in Kenya; the author ought to capture how M&E practices are conjoined with the National Monitoring and Evaluation Systems and the County Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Systems to effect performance within county Projects; save, Maternal health.