



Manuscript: “Effect of The Macro-Environment Factors On the Relationship Between Firm Resources and Export Performance of Small and Medium Scale Manufacturing Enterprises in Nairobi City County, Kenya”

Submitted: 3 August 2020

Accepted: 9 September 2020

Published: 31 October 2020

Corresponding Author: Samson Kitonyi

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n28p173

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Paul Waithaka
Kenyatta University, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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.

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: Paul Waithaka (Ph .D)	Email:
University/Country: Kenyatta /Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 10/08/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 18/08/2020
Manuscript Title: Effect of the Macro-Environment Factors on the Relationship Between firm Resources and Export Performance of Small and Medium Scale Manufacturing Enterprises in Nairobi City County, Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0866/20	
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 and adequate</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3.5
<i>Eliminate grammatical errors in the section explaining how the moderation was tested</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>What type of questionnaire was used? In the abstract it says a structured but in the methodology it is stated as semi-structured. Remove this contradiction</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
There are some grammatical errors	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Bring out the recommendation more clearly at the end of the study</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3.5
Ensure references are uniform	

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: