

Paper: **“Household Heads Characteristics and Access to Water in Kenya”**

**Submitted: 06 April 2022**

**Accepted: 16 May 2022**

**Published: 31 May 2022**

Corresponding Author: Beatrice Omondi

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n15p127](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n15p127)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Daniela Brevenikova  
University of Economics, Slovakia

Reviewer 2: Kanga Idé Soumaila  
Université Laval, Canada

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Breveníková	
University/Country: Slovakia	
Date Manuscript Received: 10/04/2022	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>HOUSEHOLD HEADS CHARACTERISTICS AND ACCESS TO WATER IN KENYA</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 39.04.2022	
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>5</b>

<i>The title reflects the content of the paper. It contains the words denoting the two phenomena whose relationships are explored in the paper.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The abstract presents the subject matter, the method applied to process the data collected (multinomial logistic regression modeling ); it briefly and succinctly mentions research results, and gives recommendations of how to solve the problem (develop policy around the key and significant household head characteristics).</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>There are few errors and misprints in the paper. I highlighted those few mistakes in red in the attached proofreading copy of the paper. (See pages 1, 13, 18, 19)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The author clearly explains study methods used in the paper. The clarity of the explanation is increased by comprehensive tables (Table 1, Table 2).</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The research results are presented meticulously; they are accurate and depicted comprehensively. Calculations are properly interpreted and related to the research question (presented at the beginning of the paper). The authors give credit to a person who processed collected data by means of statistical methods.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Section Conclusion is very well written; it summarizes the most relevant results and theoretical findings. It could be used as a model for authors of academic papers how to write a good conclusion. The authors give recommendations based on the findings presented in the paper.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The references contain sources written after the year 2000. I have not found the reference to source Development Initiative report (2018) mentioned in the body text on p. 3.</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):**

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

**I recommend to publish this interesting paper written in very good academic style in the European Scientific Journal.**

# ***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: Kanga Idé Soumaila	
University/Country: Université Laval, Canada	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>HOUSEHOLD HEADS CHARACTERISTICS AND ACCESS TO WATER IN KENYA</b>	
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]
<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>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4.5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4.5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4.5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</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):**

Paper is easy to read and understand, relevant conclusion and result, well structured.

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