
ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial teamis a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 22/04/2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:10/05/2016
Manuscript Title: CATASTROPHIC HEALTH EXPENDITURES AND IMPOVERISHMENT IN KENYA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0466/16	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-lesspoint 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>(abrief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(abrief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(abrief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(abrief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(abrief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(abrief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

1. Important indicate the institution affiliation of the authors. Superscript has been put without the mention of the meaning of the numbers.
2. The abstract needs to mention something about the problem that is being addressed
3. The problem in the body need to be made much clearer. The idea that the author is using two methodologies is not very clear. How for instance does the author know that one method is better than the other one so that the paper can demonstrate methodological superiority of one methodology over the other? This need to come out clearly in the reading.
4. Generally the paper is too long. At least a 15-20 page manuscript is highly recommended for a focused journal. In line with this I suggest that the author find a way of shortening the introduction by concentrating on some key background information that relates to the actual problem statement. I also suggest that the author restrict the work to national levels so that the paper remains focused as suggested by the title. In this way the author can maintain discussion at national level instead of moving the discussion to provincial level. As noted table, 3.1 which explain utilization is not provided.
5. Page 5 last paragraph does not add value. Remove it
6. Page 13 this statement is not important “Out of the whole data set which consisted of many variables, data on a few variables which were relevant for this exercise was extracted”.
7. Table 6 is on descriptive statistics for the variable used in the paper, hence it should be start in the result discussion section.

8. The last paragraph in page 23 should not discuss methodologies used but rather it should concentrate on comparing current findings with the past studies. It is expected that such a comparison of methods should have been mentioned in the discussion of literature.
9. The discussion of limitation is misplaced. This needed to have been mentioned in the scope of work or methodology so that the paper does not appear too lengthy in the conclusion and recommendation section. Even though, it is not clear why this was not possible to be done.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The paper reads well and can be of key interest to public health specialists as well to health economists. Its main value is in the methodological perspective which will guide health sector researchers to make an informed decision while choosing one method and not another in the estimation of catastrophic health expenditure.

