

Paper: **“Effects of Uncertainty on Domestic Private Investments in Kenya”**

**Submitted: 09 January 2023**

**Accepted: 06 June 2023**

**Published: 30 June 2023**

Corresponding Author: Onkoba Ongeru Benedicto

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n16p23](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n16p23)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Andrew Rasugu Otachi Riechi  
University Of Nairobi, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Asli Cazorla Milla  
University of the People, USA

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: 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:<br>12.03.2023  | Date Review Report Submitted:<br>22.03.2023 |
| Manuscript Title: EFFECTS OF UNCERTAINTY ON DOMESTIC PRIVATE INVESTMENTS IN KENYA                              |   |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0148/23   |   |
| 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 published version 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.

| Questions   | Rating Result<br>[Poor] 1-5<br>[Excellent] |
|---|--|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 5  |

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <i>The title accordingly expresses the goals, the outcomes and the conclusions reviewed in the general text of the article. Thus, the titles complies with the contents of the article.</i>        |          |
| <b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>  | <b>3</b> |
| <i>The abstract should be divided into Methods, Aim, Results and Conclusions. The abstract structure is wrong.</i>   |          |
| <b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>  | <b>3</b> |
| <i>Several grammar and orthographic errors are found in the work.</i>  |          |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>   | <b>5</b> |
| <i>The research methods are fully described. The methods used in the article comply with achievement of the goal of the research of the author.</i>  |          |
| <b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| <i>In the significant part of the article – discussion, some inadequate passing among the sentences is traced down. All in all, the article is original. The sources are referred to properly.</i> |          |
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| <i>The conclusions made as the result of the research comply with the set problematic, though more expansion would have been better.</i>   |          |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>  | <b>5</b> |
| <i>The used literature is interesting and selected properly.</i>   |          |

### Overall Recommendation :

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

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

The Article in the end is properly set as accordingly complies with the goal of the research. Nonetheless, it shall be indicated that the

conclusions and the outcomes should be even more explicitly determined. Some sentence's are too long and also the content is unclear.

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

It is my pleasure to relate to a scientific journal of such a high reputation. I hope that my remarks towards the author will be accepted and considered. Wish you success.

# 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: DR. ANDREW RASUGU RIECHI  |  |
| University/Country: UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI / KENYA  |  |
| Date Manuscript Received: 21/02/2023   | Date Review Report Submitted: 22/03/2023 |
| Manuscript Title: EFFECTS OF UNCERTAINTY ON DOMESTIC PRIVATE INVESTMENTS IN KENYA                          |  |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0148/23   |  |
| 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><br>[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|--|--|
| <b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b> | 5  |

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| The Title is clearly stated, as it contains the two study variables - UNCERTAINTY and DOMESTIC PRIVATE INVESTMENTS.   |          |
| <b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>   | <b>5</b> |
| As required, the abstract clearly outlines the background to the study, the need for the study as well as how it was conducted as well as the outcomes of the study.  |          |
| <b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>   | <b>4</b> |
| There are some few grammatical as well as grammatical mistakes as well as improper sentence structures. For example, “Iyoha (1999) says that when the state borrows from the domestic market, it crowds out the private sector, leaving them with less credit” on page 2 of the paper should be reviewed to read as follows: “In their study on . . . ., Iyoha (1999) <del>says</del> established that when the state borrows from the domestic market, it crowds out the private sector, leaving them with less credit”. |          |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>  | <b>5</b> |
| The authors have articulated the research methods.  |          |
| <b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>  | <b>5</b> |
| The results are well stated in the paper.   |          |
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>   | <b>5</b> |
| The conclusions are accurately made and are based on the study.   |          |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>   | <b>4</b> |
| The References are fairly well stated, but there are some few errors that need correction. For instance, in the source (Iyoha, MA 1999), needs correction, as <u>Sub-Saharan</u> is misspelt!   |          |

**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                                     | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

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

- Remove the full stop at the Title of the paper;
- Review your sentence structures so as to enhance the flow of information; to do this, include the contexts of the cited sources to make it clear to readers (for

instance, “In a study on Kenya’s business enterprises, BBB (2023) established that .....”).

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

- Check that all cited sources contain appropriate sources;
- Let the authors include more recent and relevant sources of information, including appropriate legal, planning as well as policy frameworks.

# 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:21.03.2023   | Date Review Report Submitted:<br>27.03.2023 |
| Manuscript Title: EFFECTS OF UNCERTAINTY ON DOMESTIC PRIVATE INVESTMENTS IN KENYA.                                    |   |
| ESJ Manuscript Number:0148/23   |   |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ <b>No</b>  |   |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b> /No |   |
| You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b> /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] <b>1-5</b><br>[Excellent] |



|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>   | <b>5</b> |
| <i>The title is clear, represents the content of the article. No further change is needed.</i>   |          |
| <b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>  | <b>3</b> |
| <i>In the abstract, there is no mention of the main motivator behind the article. I also could not find the methodology being mentioned here.</i>  |          |
| <b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>  | <b>5</b> |
| <i>It seems that the authors have proofread the article prior to sending for review. There are no major issues with grammar.</i>   |          |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>   | <b>4</b> |
| <i>Several reviews both theoretical and empirical method have been undertaken. The vast majority of studies on investments have been quantitative. I would have liked to see more studies supporting your choice on methodology.</i> |          |
| <b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>   | <b>5</b> |
| <i>Results have been presented in the Discussion section, a separate section would be recommended.</i>   |          |
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>  | <b>5</b> |
| <i>No change is needed as the conclusions include policy recommendations which has practical implications.</i>   |          |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>  | <b>5</b> |
| <i>Excellent references, up to date.</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):**

**It is an interesting study, hoping to see further research on it.**

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