

**Paper: “Impact of Official Development Assistance on Economic Growth in the East African Community”**

**Submitted: 07 October 2024**

**Accepted: 25 December 2024**

**Published: 31 January 2025**

Corresponding Author: Victoria Litali

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n1p62

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Róbert Szűcs  
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Daniela Breveníková  
University of Economics, Slovakia

Reviewer 3: Murry Siyasiya  
Blantyre International University, Malawi

Reviewer 4: Oumar Bah  
Sup' Management, Mali

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

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

The title precisely reflects the focus of the article, which investigates the impact of Official Development Assistance (ODA) on economic growth in the East African Community (EAC). It is concise and aligns well with the research's scope and content.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract effectively summarizes the research's objectives, methodology (VECM model), and key findings. However, it could be slightly improved by providing more details on specific quantitative results or broader implications for policymakers.

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

While the article is mostly well-written, it contains minor grammatical inconsistencies and spelling issues. For example, some sentences are overly complex or lack fluency, which slightly impacts readability.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The methodology section is well-detailed, describing the statistical techniques (e.g., cointegration tests, Granger causality) and data sources. However, the rationale for specific model choices and limitations of the methods used could have been elaborated further for greater clarity.

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

The results are presented logically, with appropriate statistical tests and tables to support them. However, inconsistencies between correlation analysis and regression results (e.g., ODA's negative correlation but positive regression coefficients) could have been discussed more thoroughly.

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

The conclusions are well-supported by the data and analyses, emphasizing the nuanced relationship between ODA and economic growth, moderated by trade openness. They align with the study's objectives and findings.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The reference list is extensive, drawing from recent and relevant sources in the field. Key empirical studies and methodological texts are cited, providing a solid foundation for the research.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*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]

5

*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 article demonstrates a strong level of academic rigor and relevance. While minor improvements could enhance clarity and address methodological nuances, it is a well-constructed scientific contribution.

Based on the thorough professional analysis of the paper:

#### 1. Strengths:

- The research is well-structured, with clear objectives and methodologies.
- The statistical analyses, such as the VECM model, cointegration test, Granger causality test, and multicollinearity checks, are well-grounded and comprehensively explained.
- The topic is relevant for understanding economic strategies in developing countries, offering practical recommendations for policymakers.

#### 2. Critical Points and Potential Errors:

- Heterogeneity of Data Sources: While the data covers a wide timespan (1974-2022), the variability in data quality and sources (e.g., World Bank and local statistical offices) could introduce bias. While this isn't a direct error, a more detailed critique of the data collection methodology would strengthen the study's credibility.
- Inconsistencies in Result Interpretation: There is a discrepancy in the findings. For instance, the correlation matrix shows a negative relationship between ODA and economic growth, while the regression models found positive effects. This may stem from a violation of normality assumptions or the presence of nonlinear relationships, which the article does not sufficiently elaborate on.
- Risk of Generalization: The findings heavily depend on the region's specific economic and political context. Generalizing the conclusions to other regions may raise concerns.

#### 3. Recommendations:

- The article could be strengthened by a more detailed examination of the specific mechanisms of ODA (e.g., sectoral allocation, administrative costs).
- Sensitivity analyses could have been conducted to better understand the effects of model selection.

- Applying additional robust statistical tests would help validate the findings.

In summary, the article is scientifically sound, but further refinement of the methodological and interpretive sections could enhance its credibility and generalizability.

-----

-----

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

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

The title is clear.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract is complete.

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

There are a few errors.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Methodology is clear except for a few issues [refer to comments in the Microsoft (MS) Word document]

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

It has no errors.

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

Conclusion is accurate except for one point [refer to comments in the Microsoft (MS) Word document]

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Reference list is appropriate.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*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):**

Please work on the issues raised as comments in the Word document.

-----

### ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

***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: Daniela Breveníková	
University/Country:	Slovak Republic
Date Manuscript Received: 11 Dec. 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 17 December 2024
Manuscript Title: <b>Impact of Official Development Assistance on Economic Growth in the East African Community</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1827 Article 54144-1-4-2024-1112(1)	
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>5</b>
<i>The title of the paper clearly denotes the topic, phenomenon investigated as well as the related location.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The aim of the paper is stated in the first sentence of the abstract. The authors refers to the “focus”. Objects, methods and results of the investigation are adequately presented in the paper.</i>	

<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>There is a single misprint, which I corrected in the copy attached (p. 4, missing letter “r” in the word “countries”).</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The author clearly and in detail explains the study methods applied in the paper (econometric approach, quantitative research, correlational research design).</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Results of statistical analysis are interpreted and presented in tables and figures.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The conclusions are supported by the content of the paper. Also this part is written clearly and succinctly. We appreciate that the author points to both negative and positive aspects in this problem area. The author also lists the factors that weaken the impact of ODA on economic growth of East African countries.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	
<i>The References section contains numerous relevant sources. Since the period analyzed in the paper is 43 years, it was necessary to use also older sources. The sources listed in this section are adequately selected, and all of them are properly cited in the paper.</i>	
<i>In several cases, the format of entries in the References had to be adjusted (see: paragraphs highlighted in yellow in the copy attached).</i>	

**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):**