

**Paper: “Ethnic Mixing and Tolerance in Mathare Informal Settlement in Nairobi City, Kenya”**

**Submitted: 26 September 2023**

**Accepted: 23 December 2023**

**Published: 31 December 2023**

Corresponding Author: Stellamaries Kyuvi

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n34p51](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n34p51)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Felix Kioli  
South Eastern Kenya University

Reviewer 2: Nicholas Otieno  
Pwani University, Kenya

# 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: <b>Felix Ngunzo Kioli</b>	
University/Country : <b>South Eastern Kenya University</b>	
Date Manuscript Received: <b>2<sup>nd</sup> November 2023</b>	Date Review Report Submitted: <b>14<sup>th</sup> November 2023</b>
Manuscript Title: <b>Ethnic Mixing and Tolerance in Urban Kenya: A case Study of Mathare Informal Settlement in Nairobi City,</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1014/23	
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]
<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> he Title is clear and comprehensible to any reader. However, my suggestion to the Authors is to have it in a continuous pros and avoid the full colons. In order to also avoid tautology through the use of word “Urban Kenya” and “Nairobi” in the same sentence I suggest the title to read, “Ethnic Mixing and Tolerance in Mathare Informal Settlement in Nairobi City, Kenya”.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract articulates the gap in knowledge fairly well as well as the methods and results. The authors are advised to make some reference to target population, sample size and sampling procedures.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Grammatical errors and spelling mistakes are quite minimal	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There is noted inconsistency with the study designed mentioned to have been utilized in the abstract and in Methodology. In the abstract, authors mention Integrative Study Design while in the section on Methodology, alludes to Interpretive Study Design. The authors should harmonize. There is also mention of mixed methods in the abstract. The authors should operationalize the utilized mixed methods approach in the methodology section.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The results are consistent with the study objectives. The only weak point in this section is on Discussion of the results. In order to be conventional, the authors are advised to present the result before discussion, objective per objective. For objective 2 and 3, the author discusses before presenting results and yet it’s supposed to be vice versa. It is also noted that results in sections 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3 and 2.2.4 are not discussed.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusions are supported by the findings. The authors have a section on recommendations and the advice is to identify an existing policy in Kenya on National Cohesion and Integration which is likely to be informed by the findings of this study.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The reference section should be properly aligned to current APA format of writing and referencing.	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

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

The Authors to refer to the comments contained in the above template for corrections.

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

It is noted that the sub sections in this article are not following the review template titles to be used in the review from ESJ.

# 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: Nicholas Ajwang'	
University/Country: Pwani University/Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 17.11.23	Date Review Report Submitted: 17.11.23
Manuscript Title: <b>ETHNIC MIXING AND TOLERANCE IN URBAN KENYA: A CASE STUDY OF MATHARE INFORMAL SETTLEMENT IN NAIROBI CITY</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1014/23	
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]
<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>Indicate Nairobi Kenya rather than Nairobi City</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>State study significance/justification of study. Indicate recommendation.</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>P 5 remove fullstop after Lupita and before Nyongo.</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>How was data analysed?</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Use percentages instead of numbers for the results</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>No clear recommendation</b>	
<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	<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):**

Implement the recommendations.

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

**Recommended for Publishing after the minor corrections.**