

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:	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title:	
INFLUENCE OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS ON PERFORMANCE OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL PROJECTS IN KENYA. A CASE OF MATERNAL HEALTH PROJECTS IN BUNGOMA SOUTH SUB-COUNTY, KENYA.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 38.08.2017	

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.	2
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Title is too long, it should be one statement only presenting the main subject of a paper	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Abstract is clear and presents objects, methods and results	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Generally there are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article and the text should	

be read once again	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The variables and abbreviations should be stated more clearly	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The paper is too long and divided into too many parts without numeration making the reader confused. There are not enough clear conclusions after every part of a paper.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The final conclusions are accurate and supported by the content even though could be more related to the theory	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The references are appropriate.	

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):

The paper is interesting in itself but in the opinion of the reviewer some additional work need to be done by the author.

First of all, the paper could be shorter, there is 34 pages of standard text right now (1,5 interline). Moreover abbreviations, defined in the beginning, but not repeated in the text make the problem difficult to understand and therefore the “story” is not interesting though the problem is important in itself. If you write a scientific paper it does not need to be boring or difficult to understand. It should be easy to read and understand.

When shorten the text should be read once again since there are some errors (words repeated, style).

According to the statement in Abstract “Scholars have shown that little progress has been achieved by the NGOs implementing various projects in the country.” Is there any theory behind this statement? There are many papers mentioned but concluding is a weak point in the text.

When the author cite a paper, the title in a text is not necessary (it happens once). Abstract: human Resource – resource, Introduction: non-governmental Organizations - Author should focus on the capital letters that apply to names or titles.

In a statement when Ooko (2014) is cited, through bringing the questions she posed, but there is no comment to this part. If you start the problem, the reader looks for the answer,

In a text some ellipsis are used, is it intentional?

The paper does not have a structure of a scientific one, Introduction with thesis, Literature review, Methods and data, Results, Summary, as it is suggested by the European Scientific Journal.

In my opinion “Significant terms” in the paper should be omitted, and as it was suggested, included in the text and repeated from time to time, and the abbreviations should be added in the appendix.

There are many rhetoric questions in the text. It is not necessary. The scientific style is based on the proven statements based on the theory rather than questions without answers.

The way it is written “According to (UNFPA, 2001),” or “A study by (Mugo & Oleche, 2015)” is not proper.

Only the year should be in brackets.

Correlation at the level 0.01 should be marked as ***.

Is R^2 calculated for the model? How do we know that the model is right if the normality and heteroskedastity is not calculated?

Author should focus on paragraphs and the problems mentioned in these parts of the text. More conclusions after every part should be given.

As a conclusion it can be said that the project management methodology should be applied to achieve better results of the projects performed by NGOs. Therefore the project management methodology should be presented in short to show the goal of projects success. You can use PMI methodology for example: www.pmi.org, and one of the books :

Project Management Institute. (1987). Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK). Project Management Institute.

Cleland, D. L., & Ireland, L. R. (2006). Project management. McGraw-Hill Professional.

Duncan, W. R. (1996). A guide to the project management body of knowledge.

Turner, J. R. (2008). Handbook of project-based management. McGraw-Hill Professional Publishing.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

