

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_110114
Title of the Manuscript:	The impact of government spending and government quality on energy poverty- a global evidence
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes. Energy poverty is becoming a significant global issue. Specially after Russia-Ukraine conflict, not just the developing world are facing the consequences but also the developed world. Therefore, the article serves an important contribution to the existing literature.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. The first line of the abstract and the title do not synchronise. It needs to be rephrased. It should include government effectiveness part. It is written at the end but it is also necessary to add it in the first sentence as it is part of the objective. Moreover, "Implications" are not mentioned as such in the paper but it written in the abstract. Add implications heading and provide some. The current ones are very precise and general in nature.</p> <p>4. There is nothing wrong with the current structure of the paper. However, as mentioned above, Implications should be mentioned with a separate heading or at least along with CONCLUSION.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. Addition of few latest articles specially for government effectiveness is recommended.</p> <p>Moreover, either add more hypothesis or remove the one also. My suggestion is to add more and provide the reasons. Also, there is only mentioning of results. There is no "discussion" of the obtained results. This must be included. Also add few quality implications instead of general.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Spelling mistakes and grammatical issues needs revision.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Saqib Bashir
Department, University & Country	Iqra University, Pakistan