

**Paper: “Corporate Governance and Performance of Commercial Banks Listed at the Nairobi Securities Exchange, Kenya”**

**Submitted: 23 August 2022**

**Accepted: 27 April 2023**

**Published: 30 April 2023**

Corresponding Author: Moses Odhiambo Aluoch

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n10p194](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n10p194)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Róbert Szűcs  
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Blinded

# 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!*

Date Manuscript Received:18-0-2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 2023
Manuscript Title: Impact of corporate governance on financial performance of banks listed in Nairobi stock exchange	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:No	
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>3</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</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</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</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	<b>x</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

-You can elaborate more financial interpretations of model

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

**-The subject of governance is classic and you need to encourage the new subjects such as finance green**

# 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: 22.03.2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 26.03.2023
Manuscript Title: Corporate Governance and Performance of Commercial Banks Listed at the Nairobi Securities Exchange, Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 24.09.2022	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>The title accurately reflects the content of the paper and clearly conveys the main topic of the article, which is exploring corporate governance and performance of commercial banks listed at the Nairobi securities exchange, Kenya.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<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. <b>The abstract is a bit long and could contain more results.</b></i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The paper is well-written and there are only a few minor grammatical errors and spelling mistakes throughout the article.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The study methods are clearly explained, including the search strategy used to identify relevant studies, the inclusion and exclusion criteria, and the data extraction process. The methods used are appropriate for a systematic review and the author provides a detailed description of the process used to identify and select studies for inclusion.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The results of the systematic review are clearly presented and well-supported by the studies included in the review. The author provides a thorough analysis of the findings, including a discussion of the limitations of the studies included in the review. <b>The analysis becomes a little bit one-sided and monotonous after the umpteenth table.</b></i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<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>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<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	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>

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:**