

Paper: “Exploring the Role of Decentralization in Resource Marginalization in Kenya”

Submitted: 21 November 2022

Accepted: 13 March 2023

Published: 31 March 2023

Corresponding Author: Nicholas Walter Otieno Ajwang

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n7p45](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n7p45)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Szűcs Róbert Sándor
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Ricardo Furfaro
Universidad de Ciencias Empresariales y Sociales, Argentina

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: Ricardo Furfaro	
University/Country: Universidad de Ciencias Empresariales y Sociales/Argentina	
Date Manuscript Received: February 26, 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: March 2, 2023
Manuscript Title: Exploring the Role of Decentralization in Resource Marginalization in Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1213/23	
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>Title of article is descriptive and not assertive, and as such is clear enough and aligned with content</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Though objects, methods and results are clearly addressed, a definition of the term “increased decentralization” for the Kenyan context is missing. It will contribute to understand the results of the study</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>-Though grammar and spelling are optimal, there are instances in which sentences are too long and content too many ideas/concepts (i.e. last sentence of first paragraph of Introduction. -“devolution of government & funds” should be corrected to read “devolution of government funds”</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>There is a clear explanation and description of study methods</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Results are presented clearly and error-free</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>It is recommended that conclusions should be more elaborated to allow support for article content. Quantitative research has been restricted to only one county (UG) out of the 47 counties in Kenya. There is room for additional research and this is expressly recognized by the author</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>References are comprehensive, appropriate and adequate to article content</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):

It is suggested that article be revised taking into consideration comments made in the Evaluation section. Such comments are focused to better sustain the results of the article by strengthening its content

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: Róbert Sándor Szűcs Dr. habil.	
University/Country: University of Debrecen, Hungary	
Date Manuscript Received: 24.02.2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 25.02.2023
Manuscript Title: Exploring the Role of Decentralization in Resource Marginalization in Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1213/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	

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>The title accurately reflects the content of the paper and clearly conveys the main topic of the article, which is exploring the relationship between decentralization and resource marginalization in Kenya.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract provides a clear overview of the paper's objectives, methods, and results. It briefly summarizes the key points of the paper and effectively conveys the importance of the research. The abstract could present more results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>The paper is well-written and there are only a few minor grammatical errors and spelling mistakes throughout the article.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The study methods are explained but provide a little bit insufficient detail for the reader to understand the research design and methods used. When were the surveys (quantitative and qualitative) carried out, by whom and by what method? Detailed description? The methodology is incomplete.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are presented clearly and effectively support the research objectives. The findings are based on a rigorous analysis of the data collected. I think the chapter also contains redundant elements. The presentation of the results could be more detailed. How did the author reach the conclusions he did? Without the details, some of the results are intuitive.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusions are well-supported by the content of the paper and effectively summarize the key findings. The authors offer insightful recommendations for policy and practice based on their research.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriately cited throughout the paper. The authors draw on a wide range of sources to support their arguments and provide a comprehensive review of the existing literature on the topic.</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):

According the above mentioned comments the paper should be corrected.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: