Paper: **"Relationship between Transformational Leadership and Church Health: A Survey of Selected Denominational Churches in Nairobi City County, Kenya"**

Corresponding Author: Mwongeli Muthuku

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Janet Wagude
Rongo University, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Franca Daniele
"G. d'Annunzio" University, Chieti-Pescara, Italy

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Title is clear and adequate in content and the variables of the study has been well articulated

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The objects,methods and results are well articulated in the abstract

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Grammatical error is very minimal,spelling mistakes have not been detected

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Methods of analysis is clearly explained,however the author need to make a justification why he choose multifactor leadership questionnaire.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is quite comprehensive and literature is relevant to the title,however the author should avoid using archaic references

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Conclusion is accurate showing content that has been used to make conclusion

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

References are comprehensive however the author should completely avoid references that are not within five years unless they are models,theory or mathematical formulas.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

A good effort shown however the paper should have captured the objectives of the study,further the conclusion should have been done in accordance with the objectives.A justification should also have been made why you choose MLQ for data collection.

Reviewer I:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is consistent with the theme discussed in the article

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract describes briefly aim, methodology and results

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The manuscript is well written. It needs re-reading, especially in relation to some verb tenses.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodology is reported in-depth and is adequate for the aim.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The manuscript is well written. However, since the analysis contains many tables, I suggest separating the results section from the Discussion section.
This makes the article clearer and easier to read and follow.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The statements in the Conclusion section are accurate, but the recommendations should be reported in a separate section.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are consistent and updated. However, they should be written using the ESJ format.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):