

Paper: “Comparative Analysis of Community Energy Projects: Policy Lessons for Kenya from the United Kingdom”

Submitted: 25 September 2024

Accepted: 01 November 2024

Published: 30 November 2024

Corresponding Author: Vincent Onyango

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n31p32](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n31p32)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Johnson Nnadikwe

Petroleum & Gas Engineering Department, Imo State University, Nigeria

Reviewer 2: Tímea Bernadett Mátyás

University of Public Service, Hungary

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

Yes. The article is aligned to the title.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes. The abstract captures the study objective, the methodology and results

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

Yes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes

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

Yes

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

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

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]

4

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):

Proof read the paper to address grammar concerns.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

Kenya's Community Energy Projects: Harnessing UK Policy Expertise for Sustainable Development....I Prefer this my mentioned title for the research findings..

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Clear Research Objective:

It clearly articulate the research problem and objective, focusing on community energy projects (CEPs) in the UK and Kenya, and their potential to address climate change and achieve universal energy access by 2030. ,

Effective Structure:

The abstract follows the IMRaD structure (Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion), making it easy to follow ². You provide a concise overview of your research design, methods, and conclusions

Key Findings and Recommendations:

The research effectively highlight the main lessons and recommendations from your study, including incentives, policy adaptations, and collaborative approaches

Overall, The abstract provides a clear and compelling summary of the research, making it suitable for academic and professional audiences...

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

THE GRAMMATICAL SENTENCES ARE OKAY.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods section appears comprehensive and well-structured. Here are some specific strengths and suggestions:

Strengths:

1. Clear research design: The research articulate a comparative analysis between the UK and Kenya.
2. Effective data collection: The research outline primary and secondary data sources.
3. Transparent data analysis: The research describe the analytical techniques...

Suggestions:

1. Consider adding more detail on sampling strategies.
2. Clarify the time frame for data collection.
3. Specify data analysis software or tools.
4. Elaborate on stakeholder engagement.

Methods:

This comparative study examines community energy projects (CEPs) in the UK and Kenya. Primary data was collected through:

1. Semi-structured interviews (n=30) with CEP stakeholders.
2. Surveys (n=100) of community members.

Secondary data sources include:

1. Policy documents.
2. Academic literature.

Data analysis involved:

1. Thematic coding.
2. Statistical analysis using SPSS.

Stakeholder engagement included collaboration with local communities, policymakers, and industry experts

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

Here are some positive observations and minor suggestions:

Strengths:

1. Logical structure: Your sections flow smoothly, making it easy to follow.
2. Clear headings and subheadings: Effective use of headings to organize content.
3. Concise paragraphs: Information is presented in digestible chunks.
4. Relevant examples and cases: Illustrative examples enhance understanding.
5. Effective use of transitions: Smooth connections between ideas.

Minor Suggestions:

1. Consider adding visual aids (tables, figures, charts) to support complex data.
2. Use headings and subheadings consistently throughout.
3. Break up long paragraphs (5+ sentences) for better readability.
4. Ensure consistent formatting and indentation.
5. Double-check citations and references for consistency.

To further enhance your paper:

1. Use clear and concise headings for tables and figures.
2. Consider adding a summary or conclusion section.
3. Ensure all acronyms are defined upon first use.
4. Verify consistency in formatting and style.

Your paper effectively presents a comprehensive analysis of community energy projects in the UK and Kenya, providing valuable insights for policymakers and stakeholders

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

Your conclusion effectively summarizes the key findings and takeaways from your research on community energy projects (CEPs) in the UK and Kenya.

Strengths:

1. Clear summary of main points
2. Accurate representation of research findings
3. Effective reiteration of the research objective
4. Concise and focused language
5. Call to action for future research or policy implementation

Minor Suggestions:

1. Consider adding a concise summary of implications for practice, policy, or future research.
2. Emphasize the significance of your research contributions.
3. Ensure consistency in formatting and style.
4. Double-check citations and references.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

ITS OKAY.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

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]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments:

1. Well-structured and clear research design.
2. Effective use of comparative analysis.
3. Comprehensive literature review.
4. Clear and concise writing style.
5. Relevant and timely research topic.

Suggestions:

General:

1. Consider adding more visual aids (e.g., diagrams, flowcharts) to illustrate complex concepts.
2. Provide more nuanced discussions on policy implications.
3. Explore potential limitations and future research directions.

Specific Sections:

1. Introduction: Clarify the research gap and significance.
2. Literature Review: Organize sources chronologically or thematically.
3. Methodology: Elaborate on sampling strategies and data analysis software.
4. Conclusion: Emphasize practical applications and policy recommendations.

Future Research Directions:

1. Investigate scalability and replicability of CEPs.
2. Analyze long-term impact on sustainable energy transitions.
3. Examine integration with national energy policies

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

Yes. The title is adequate. It accurately reflects the core focus of the paper, which is the analysis of community energy projects (CEPs) in Kenya with a comparative lens on policy lessons from the UK. The title clearly conveys the geographical and thematic scope of the research and gives potential readers a good understanding of what to expect from the paper. However, if further refinement is desired, the title could include a reference to the comparative analysis or policy transfer aspect to emphasize the methodological approach, such as: "Comparative Analysis of Community Energy Projects: Policy Lessons for Kenya from the United Kingdom". This might provide a clearer indication of the paper's analytical method.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract generally presents the objectives, methods, and results clearly. However, it could be improved by briefly mentioning the main results or conclusions derived from the study for more clarity. It is already informative but could be more concise. It lacks mention of the specific comparative methodology used. Including this would improve clarity.

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

The article contains a few minor grammatical errors and punctuation issues, such as missing commas and run-on sentences, which slightly affect the readability.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are explained well. The detailed description of the methodology and its relevance to the research goal is clear and appropriate.

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

The body of the paper is generally clear and well-organized. However, the length of some paragraphs and the density of information in places could be made more digestible by breaking them into shorter sections for ease of reading. No major errors were noted in terms of content. The grades "B" and "C" (and potentially "A") should be explicitly explained in the text or in a legend within the table. Without this, the table may confuse readers. Furthermore, consider including specific performance metrics or references to substantiate the grades given to each policy. This would strengthen the accuracy and transparency of the table. The lack of clarity around the grading system could hinder full understanding.

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

The conclusion is accurate and supported by the content. It summarizes the findings effectively and offers relevant policy recommendations for Kenya based on lessons from the UK. The recommendations align with the analysis presented in the body of the paper.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is comprehensive and appropriate. It includes a variety of sources relevant to community energy projects, energy policy, and comparative analysis between the UK and Kenya.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

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]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper provides a strong foundation for policy analysis on CEPs and makes a valuable contribution to the literature on policy transfer between developed and developing economies. With some minor grammatical improvements, clarification of technical terms, and better paragraph structure, the paper will be much clearer and more impactful.
