

Paper: “Effect of Funding Diversification on the Financial Performance of Nongovernmental Organizations in Kenya: A Case of Kenya Red Cross Society”

Submitted: 20 January 2022

Accepted: 16 March 2022

Published: 31 March 2022

Corresponding Author: Jacinta Wakasa Nato

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n9p64](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n9p64)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Enida Pulaj
University of Vlora, Albania

Reviewer 2: Jacques de Vos Malan
University of Melbourne, Australia

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: 03.02.2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 14.02.2022
Manuscript Title: EFFECTS OF FUNDING DIVERSIFICATION ON THE FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS IN KENYA: A CASE OF KENYA RED CROSS SOCIETY	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0210/22	
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>
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] 5
The title is clear and it fits properly with the content of the article.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The abstract is clear. It contains all the major aspects of the paper such as: the overall purpose of the study, the research problem, the methodology and the major findings as a result of data analysis.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
There are some typing errors such as the spaces between words and some other words need proofreading.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The study method is explained clearly and correctly. The tables need to be formatted.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The results are clear and they are explained correctly.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusion part is accurate and supported by the content of the paper such as: literature review and data analysis.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The references are extensive and cover a broad spectrum of the literature.	

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):

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: Dr Jacques de Vos Malan	
University/Country: University of Melbourne, Australia	
Date Manuscript Received: 16.02.22	Date Review Report Submitted: 18.02.22
Manuscript title: Effects of funding diversification on the financial performance of non governmental organizations in Kenya: a case of Kenya red cross society	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.	5

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are some language problems that could easily be corrected and some typos - e.g "Columbia" should read Colombia</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>I am not qualified to comment on the statistical methods used</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

A very lucid paper. Congratulations!

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: