

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_103542
Title of the Manuscript:	Relationship between Energy consumption, carbon dioxide emissions and economic growth: evidence from selected top oil energy-consuming countries
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljenrr.com/index.php/JENRR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>The manuscript is significant to the scientific community even though it needs revision.</p> <p>The title is suitable.</p> <p>Abstract part is somewhat good. However, the author should rewrite the abstract part as per the authors' guidelines for the journal. Re-arrange this part by looking at the paper template.</p> <p>The abstract is somewhat comprehensive. However, it still needs revision regarding significant variables.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are not as per the author's guidelines. Even the subsections were mixed. It needs correction to make the manuscript sound.</p> <p>The citation is incorrect. The reference is not as per the guidelines. There were a number of audited empirical findings cited in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language usage in the manuscript requires some revisions. Details of my comments were attached to the email with this review form. In terms of grammar, the author should revise the work. The past tense should be used instead of future tenses used in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Abstract part is somewhat good. However, the author should rewrite the abstract part as per the authors' guidelines for the journal. Re-arrange this part by looking at the paper template. The author should add the significance value of significant variables.</p> <p>The author missed the citation and reference style of the journal. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets.</p> <p>The researcher should re-arrange his/her manuscript by focusing only on the main points like the abstract, introduction, materials and methods, result, discussion, conclusion, and recommendation parts. In general, the author should follow the author guidelines of the journal.</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>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Urgessa Tilahun Bekabil
Department, University & Country	Jimma University, Ethiopia