

Paper: “Impact of Cash Transfers Programme on Agricultural Production in Kenya: Focus on the Orphans and Vulnerable Children”

Submitted: 10 July 2023

Accepted: 03 December 2023

Published: 31 December 2023

Corresponding Author: David Katuta Ndolo

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n34p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n34p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Albert Simiyu
University of Nairobi, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Gerxhi Julejda
University “Alexander Moisiu” Durres, Albania

Reviewer 3: Enriko Ceko
Canadian Institute of Technology, Albania

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: Prof asoc.Dr. Julejda Aliaj (Gërxhi)	
University/Country: Department of Law, Faculty of Political Sciences, University "Alexander Moisiu" Durres, Albania.	
Date Manuscript Received: 21.07.2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 29.07.2023
Manuscript Title: Impact of cash transfers programme on agricultural production in Kenya: Focus on the orphans and vulnerable.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 0750/23	
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
The title excels in clarity and comprehensiveness, deftly integrating essential keywords to offer a thorough glimpse into its contents and the discoveries awaiting readers within its pages. Moreover, it sheds light on the significant	

<p>impact that cash transfer programs exert indirectly on the most vulnerable segment of society, namely children.</p>	
<p>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>The abstract stands as a succinct encapsulation of the article's essence, providing readers with a glimpse of its core content and the principal themes that will be explored in depth. While the methodology remains discreetly omitted within this initial summary, its full exposition awaits in the comprehensive structure of the article.</p> <p>The article is organized into several sections, starting with an Abstract (1 page) that provides a concise overview of the study. The Introduction (3 pages) sets the context and presents the research's objectives. The Literature Review (4 pages) critically examines relevant existing works. The Methodology section (4 pages) outlines the approach and techniques employed for the study. Data description and sources (1 page) briefly provide information about the data used. Results and Discussion (4 pages) present the findings and their implications. The Summary Conclusions (1 page) offer a concise wrap-up of the key points discussed in the article. Finally, the References (4 pages) section lists the sources cited throughout the paper.</p> <p>In the Abstract, a portion of it also includes the Summary Conclusions, which serve as a quick summary of the article's main outcomes. Additionally, the Abstract should briefly touch on the methods and materials utilized, recognizing their significance as one of the fundamental pillars of the paper.</p>	
<p>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>The writing adheres to standard formatting and is mostly accurate. However, the article's language complexity may limit its comprehension to readers with a basic understanding of finance and accounting. Certain paragraphs require revisions to enhance clarity, but the article's structure remains intact.</p>	
<p>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>The article provides a detailed explanation of the research methods employed, which consist of documentary, analysis, theoretical, and analytical research approaches. The methodology section extensively covers the study's process and findings, incorporating a significant portion of the work and conclusions.</p>	
<p>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>The outcomes of the research are undeniably evident and expertly integrated into the overall structure of the article, enhancing its cohesiveness and logical flow. Throughout the review of the paper, it becomes apparent that the author has diligently arranged the findings, ensuring they fit seamlessly into the broader context of the study. This deliberate organization fosters a sense of clarity and purpose, which undoubtedly contributes to the reader's understanding and appreciation of the subject matter.</p>	
<p>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</p>	<p>4</p>

The paper's conclusions are not only coherent with its entire development but also substantiated by a diligent study conducted with well-defined hypotheses and concrete analyses. The author's use of data examples to derive qualitative results enhances the credibility of the findings. The logical connection present throughout the article, underpinned by thorough tests and data analysis, ensures a compelling and informative reading experience for the audience, solidifying the paper's significance and value in contributing to the broader body of knowledge.

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.

5

The article thoroughly encompasses a comprehensive array of references, expertly cited throughout its content. These references, meticulously compiled and neatly organized, extend across four pages at the conclusion of the article, providing readers with an extensive repository of texts that the author has drawn upon to develop and substantiate their work. As a result, this compilation of references serves as an invaluable and easily accessible resource for anyone seeking to verify the sources utilized in the material.

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):

Overall, the article showcases a well-developed and thought-provoking study. The author skillfully employs highly effective methods to derive compelling conclusions throughout the paper. The successful integration of well-defined hypotheses and meticulous data processing has played a crucial role in obtaining robust results, further reinforcing the credibility of the findings.

While the article is commendable in many aspects, there are a few areas that could benefit from slight improvements. For instance, a revision of the abstract is recommended to include a succinct description of the methodology used. By incorporating this essential information, readers will gain a clearer understanding of the research approach right from the outset, enhancing the article's accessibility and appeal.

Additionally, the paper's overall quality can be significantly enhanced by including practical recommendations within the conclusions section. Such recommendations would expand the scope of the study and provide valuable insights for future research or practical applications. By offering actionable suggestions, the author can contribute to the broader understanding and application of the study's implications.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The suggestions provided to the editors pertain to the article's structure, aiming to enhance its precision and clarity for optimal reader comprehension. To achieve this goal, the following proposed structure is recommended:

1. Introduction
2. Literature Review
3. Methodology
4. Results and Discussions
5. Conclusion
6. References

By adhering to this recommended structure, the article will achieve a cohesive and reader-friendly format, facilitating a clear and smooth comprehension of the research. Additionally, this organization will elevate the article's impact and enable readers to better grasp the research's significance and potential contributions to the academic community.

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: Albert Simiyu	
University/Country: Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 14 th July, 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 21 st July 2023
Manuscript Title: “Impact Of Cash Transfers Programme On Agricultural Production In Kenya: Focus On The Orphans And Vulnerable Children”	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 50.07.2023	
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 “review history” 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 [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5

<i>The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The abstract is clear. It contains all the main aspects of the study such as the purpose of the study, the research problem, the methodology employment to arrive at the results and the main findings of the study.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>There are grammatical errors. The author needs to read through the paper again and make necessary corrections.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The author has adequately and clearly explained the study methods.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The author has explained the results clearly and correctly.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusion and summary are accurate and supported by the literature and study findings</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</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	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Enriko Ceko	
University/Country: Canadian Institute of Technology/Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: 12 th July 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 3 rd August 2023
Manuscript Title: IMPACT OF CASH TRANSFERS PROGRAMME ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION IN KENYA: FOCUS ON THE ORPHANS AND VULNERABLE CHILDREN	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0750/23	
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.	4
<i>The title is clear, but to be improved, a period of time needs to be added. For example</i> IMPACT OF CASH TRANSFERS PROGRAMME ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION IN KENYA (between 2000 – 2022): FOCUS ON THE ORPHANS AND VULNERABLE CHILDREN	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>The abstract doesn't present clearly the objectives, methods, and results of the research, besides they are mentioned vaguely in the abstract.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>As per Premium Grammar, there are several grammatical issues to be solved.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<p><i>The study methods are not explained clearly.</i></p> <p><i>The authors write: "... In the cases where panel data is available with both pre-and post-intervention information..."</i></p> <p><i>, and later: The study uses the Phase 2 of the CT-OVC program involved impact evaluation, for which UNICEF contracted Oxford Policy Management (OPM). OPM undertook a baseline quantitative survey of households and communities within the seven UNICEF/DFID-supported districts (Garissa, Homa Bay, Kisumu, Kwale, Migori, Nairobi and Suba) for period March and August 2007. In each district, two locations were randomly selected to benefit from the intervention and two acted as controls, to be assisted later during program expansion. In each location, households were selected for evaluation according to the programme eligibility criteria. Among eligible households, priority was given to those with the youngest child caregivers; and/or the oldest adult caregivers; and/or disabled household members; and/or the highest number of OVCs. Within treatment localities, 1,540 eligible households were eventually selected to be CT-OVC recipients, for evaluation against 754 eligible households in the control localities (Ward, Hurrell, et al. 2010). Households in both arms were surveyed prior to knowledge of selection (Carolina Population Center 2011). OPM re-interviewed 1,328 recipient households and 579 control households between March and July 2009 in a follow-up survey, following a panel design. The attrition of households between baseline and midline was higher than hoped for and was, in part, due to the 2007/08 post-election violence. A second follow-up survey was conducted by the Carolina Population Center in 2011, interviewing 1,811 of the households (Carolina Population Center 2011). This study utilizes longitudinal data comprising of merged individual level datasets from the three waves (2007, 2009 and 2011). Our data merging results in a total of 19,724 individual observations from 1,810 households." ... but there is no information about the questions asked to the communities.</i></p> <p><i>Saying that: the study uses data from a (financed???) Oxford Policy Management research. Do the authors have a permit to use these data? So, data collection is not part of this study, and does this mean authors just are using data from other sources?</i></p>	

Is not clear enough if the authors have done the by themselves data processing, or if this was done by previous researchers of OPM.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>Since there is no information about questionnaires there is no clear result.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The results present the problems of orphans and vulnerable children in Kenya until 2011, without any implication for the 2011 – 2022 period, and predictions for the future of such programs in Kenya’s countryside.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Most of the references are old ones and doesn.t have any relation to the specific issue of the article which is agricultural financial support for orphans and vulnerable children in Kenya.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The research data are from 2007 – 2011. If there is any other data for the period of 2011 – 2022, especially for the pandemics period the research should have been much more interesting. History is important but remains history, while in the Kenya countryside, orphans and vulnerable children are still a social issue. How are they supported recently?

The contribution of the authors in this study is not clear, as well as where this study leads for the future.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: