

**Paper: “Participatory Project Monitoring and Evaluation and Performance of Mango Farming Projects in Makueni County, Kenya”**

**Submitted: 02 March 2022**

**Accepted: 12 April 2022**

**Published: 30 April 2022**

Corresponding Author: Charles Kyale Kisumbi

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n12p84](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n12p84)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Michael Banutu-Gomez  
Rowan University, USA

Reviewer 2: Arlinda Ymeraj  
European University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 3: Berenyi Laszlo  
University of Miskolc, Hungary

# 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: Michael Banutu-Gomez	
University/Country: Rowan University	
Date Manuscript Received: Thu 3/3/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 3/28/2022
Manuscript Title: <b>Participatory Project Monitoring and Evaluation and Performance of Mango Farming Projects in Makueni County, Kenya</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0333/22	
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> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
------------------	--

<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The title is clear and adequate for this article. Though it is long.</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The abstract clearly achieved its goal. The purpose of this article is to show the necessity of crafting a feasible project monitoring and evaluation policy for practice which would be an indispensable appraisal tool for assessing performance of mango projects. The word highlighted in red should be added.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
The purpose of this article is to show the necessity of crafting a feasible project monitoring and evaluation policy for practice which would be an indispensable appraisal tool for assessing performance of mango projects.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>x</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

This was a well-structured research paper. The authors need to do minor edit to the abstract and the body of the paper for some missing words.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**The paper was well laid out and the methodology was clear. The authors need to edit the word spacing in the body of the paper.**

# ***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: Arlinda Ymeraj	
University/Country: Luarasi University, Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: March 30	Date Review Report Submitted: April 14
Manuscript Title: Participatory Project Monitoring and Evaluation and Performance of Mango Farming Projects in Makueni County, Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 33.03.2022	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
The title is clear and adequate to the content of the article	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>There are few grammatical errors and spelling, but the whole article has to be re-formatted in a nice shape.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Very clearly and relevant</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The results are clear and do not contain errors, but some parts of results have to be moved to the conceptual framework and methodology.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The conclusions are accurate and supported strongly by the content.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Some of references are very old.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The author has to read carefully the comments in track change and to revise the article, which is very interesting and developed in a very pertinent manner.

**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!***

Date Manuscript Received: 03.03.2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 06.03.2022
Manuscript Title: Participatory Project Monitoring and Evaluation and Performance of Mango Farming Projects in Makueni County, Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 33.03.2022	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    Yes/ <u>No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /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>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The title is a bit complex but acceptable.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>The abstract includes the necessary information; it can raise the attention of the readers.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>A thorough grammar review is required.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The goals and methods are clear.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The results seem to be correct.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The conclusions are supported by the analysis.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The items are acceptable, but the formatting of the list of references must be uniform.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

A goal and the structure of the paper are appropriate. Scientific soundness is correct; the analysis is thorough. Based on a Turnitin test, no plagiarism is found; the similarity index is 14%, limited to literature issues. Conclusions and recommendations could include more details of the ideas.

A final grammar check must be performed, and the list of references is not uniform.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

-