

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 team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 10/04/2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 7/04/2017
Manuscript Title: EXPORTS AS A DETERMINANT OF INFLATION IN KENYA: DISAGGREGATED ECONOMETRIC ANALYSIS	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 79.04.2017	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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>Simple and clear</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>I'd say in an energetic way!</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>No evidence of. I only recommend a robust editing for different fonts/sizes</i>	
<i>Edited font size based on authors guide where subheadings are time Romans 14 and body 12</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Very clear and professionally academic way</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>The main problem lies in chapter 3.3 Measurement of Variables, basically based on a redundant source (Njuru, 2012) revision of this point is strongly advised.</i>	
Revision done based on Government of Kenya (2016) definition	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>It is clear, but there the lack of future improvements.</i>	
Last paragraph under conclusion and recommendations	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Appropriate, mostly, but very local. There is no evidence of robust internationally recognized sources, that might help authors to spread widely this very interesting work.</i>	
Reference covered (Malaysia – Asia, Nigeria – Africa, Jordan – Middle East, Bangladesh – South Asia) among others	

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):

Dear author, it is a very well done work, and I enjoyed reading it! A few improvements may enormously enhance your research: a more robust and international use of sources; a clearer statement of future improvements/actual limitations and a better editing.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

