



European Journal of Economics, Law and Politics

Paper: “**Drought as a Determinant on Retention of Pupils in Public Primary Schools: A Case of Garissa County-Northern Kenya**”

Submitted: 02 December 2024

Accepted: 19 March 2025

Published: 31 March 2025

Corresponding Author: Bonn Jonyo

Doi: [10.19044/elp.v12no1a1](https://doi.org/10.19044/elp.v12no1a1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1:

Andrej Semenov

Reviewer 2:

Nino Kharitonashvili

ELP Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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: ELP 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.

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

Date Manuscript Received: 25.12.2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 20.01,2025
Manuscript Title: Drought as a Determinant on Retention of Pupils in Public Primary Schools: A Case of Garissa County -Northern Kenya	
Manuscript Number:	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4

--

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper is interesting and undoubtedly addresses a topical issue, especially in terms of the interaction between education and climate. It would also be interesting to discuss the combined use of online tools in terms of improving the quality of education.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ELP Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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: ELP 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.

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

Date Manuscript Received: 25.12.2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 30.12.2024
Manuscript Title: Drought as a Determinant on Retention of Pupils in Public Primary Schools: A Case of Garissa County -Northern Kenya	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
Yes.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

Absolutely. The authors open the abstract with the object of the paper, followed by an explanation of how they aim to address it, clearly stating the findings in the last sentence.

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

As a non-native speaker, I refrain from commenting on grammar mistakes (in my best attempt, I have not found any). Also, there are no spelling mistakes. However, there are several technical/formatting errors: an unnecessary dot in the title (page 1), extra spaces between subtitles and the main text (pages 2, 4, and 5), and extra space for the reference “Nkedianye...”.

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Yes, the methods are appropriate and well explained.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>Yes, the structure of the paper is appropriate for its objective.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Absolutely.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4.5
<i>Yes. However, the references are missing DOIs/links. Additionally, two references seem incomplete: Bonaya, G. (2014) and Gitau, G. (2013). I assume both are doctoral dissertations, which should be specified accordingly.</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I am glad to recommend the paper for publication. The only reason for selecting “minor revision” instead of “no revision” is related to the references. No further round of revision is necessary.