



Paper: “Upscaling Corporate Governance Principles for Performance of National Sports Federations in Kenya and Beyond”

Submitted: 24 April 2025

Accepted: 19 June 2025

Published: 30 June 2025

Corresponding Author: Mical Oluteyo Mumani

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n16p124

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ricardo Daniel Furfaro

Universidad de Ciencias Empresariales y Sociales, Argentina

Reviewer 2: Arlinda Ymeraj

European University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: Ricardo Daniel Furfaro	
University/Country: Universidad de Ciencias Empresariales y Sociales/Argentina	
Date Manuscript Received: June 11, 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: June 14, 2025
Manuscript Title: Upscaling Corporate Governance Principles for Performance of National Sports Federations in Kenya and Beyond	
ESJ Manuscript Number: esipreprint.5.2025.p299	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Agreed	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Agreed	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Agreed	

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>Title clearly reflects and is reasonably adequate to the content of the article</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
<i>Abstract presents clearly defined objectives, methods and results</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>No grammatical errors and spelling mistakes were found</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Research methodologies have been clearly explained</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4

<i>Taking into consideration that the scope of the research has been limited to the effects of transparency, accountability, sustainability and integrity on performance by the National Sports Federation, Nairobi City County, Kenya, it is pertinent to make a recommendation for inclusion as a clarification. This is to include reference in the body of the research that the effects indicated herein are not typically obtained immediately, but it is a step-by-step, progressive and on-going process with specific goals to be included in a roadmap, and hurdles to surpass. This is part of a continuous improvement process (Process Excellence)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Conclusions are accurate and supported by content. Inclusion of a clarification as indicated in item 5 above is pertinent</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>References are considered to be comprehensive and appropriate</i>	

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): The recommendation is to clarify that the effects of transparency, accountability, sustainability and integrity on performance are not immediate. It is a step-by-step on-going process with progressive results in the form of continuous improvement (Process Excellence)

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: Luarasi-Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: June 16	Date Review Report Submitted: June 16
Manuscript Title: Upscaling Corporate Governance Principles for Performance of National Sports Federations in Kenya and Beyond	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 22.05.2025	
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, adequate to the content, although a bit complicated.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
<i>Yes, fully.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are very few grammatical errors</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Excellent</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Very clear, no errors.</i>	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Very accurate and supported by the content</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Very comprehensive and appropriate.</i>	

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):

The authors have elaborated a very interesting topic, relevant to a broader audience, although not very common. They dealt with it in a very original manner. They will find in the document very few comments. Congratulations.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: