Paper: **"Drivers of Health Insurance Coverage in Low Income Settlements: A Case of Kibera Informal Settlement, Nairobi County, Kenya"**

Corresponding Author: Emmah Ng'ang'a

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Minder, Susanna
IU International University, Germany

Reviewer 2: Elena Hunt
Laurentian University, Canada

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: Elena Hunt	
University/Country: Laurentian University, Canada	
Date Manuscript Received: May 10	Date Review Report Submitted: May 15
Manuscript Title: **Drivers of Health Insurance Coverage in Low Income Settlements: A Case of Kibera Informal Settlement, Nairobi County, Kenya**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 70042023	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
(Please insert your comments) *Manuscript needs proofreading, some if which was provided directly in the attached text, under track changes.*	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**
(Please insert your comments) • *In light of the research question and statement, the study design qualifies as descriptive-exploratory, giving way to a predictive aspect.* • *When was data collection carried out? Please include this in the method section.* • *How was data collection carried out beyond the use of a questionnaire?*	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) *Please, see comments in the text.*	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	

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):

This article is clear and timely. Please consider my suggestions and modifications in the text. Good luck!