



Paper: **“Post-Devolution Household Healthcare Expenditures in Rural Kenya”**

Submitted: 24 October 2024

Accepted: 30 January 2025

Published: 31 January 2025

Corresponding Author: Peter Kabuka Omaa

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2025.v21n1p101](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2025.v21n1p101)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Arlinda Ymeraj
European University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 2: Blinded

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: Arlinda Ymeraj	
University/Country: University Luarasi, Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: December 7th	Date Review Report Submitted: December 20th
Manuscript Title: Post-Devolution Household Healthcare Expenditures in Rural Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1114/24	
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
<i>The title is very clear and adequate to the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
<i>Very well elaborated abstract.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>I couldn't identify any errors.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Very clear and pertinent study methods, explained very clearly.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5

<i>The results are formulated in a very clear and correct way.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusions are accurate, supported by the content and very relevant for a large audience.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Well done and appropriate</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

No comments. Only congratulations. The article is written in a simple and clear way, straight to the point, while methods and results are clearly formulated. The whole analysis is thorough, detailed and relevant. Conclusions are valid for a large audience, especially of countries in which Health Care is under reformation.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: