

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Economics, Management and Trade |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JEMT_96832 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Exploring the relationship between urbanization and energy consumption using time series data: Evidence from the SARRC 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.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/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 of great relevance to scientific community. It has field data for many countries and a lot of mathematical/scientific processing. Novel metrics have also been suggested.</p> <p>Title is suitable with possible reduction in words (optional) using “urbanization and energy consumption: Analysis, using time series data, from the SARRC countries” Title should usually be in Title Case. (may also apply to sub-section titles). Plus review the term “SARRC”. Confirm if it is not “SAARC”. The two terms have been found in the manuscript and hence there is need to harmonise use of the term.</p> <p>Abstract is good enough. However, in my opinion, an abstract should be between 200-250 words so as to ensure important relevant information are not missed out. A suggestion to upgrade the abstract including more such identified important elements of information is made here. A suggestion of the UN SDG alignment is made here. A mention of design of new metrics may be made</p> <p>The sub-sections and structure very appropriate. Contents have a logical Flow of research deliverables with mathematical technicalities as well as explanations of significance of result values.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct, with field data and approved mathematical methods of analysis to produce relevant results.</p> <p>Yes, the references are plentiful and appropriately placed in-text. They are recent enough, considering the study time and processing for this manuscript.</p> <p>Word “cointegration” – change to “co-integration”. Many more important terms have been used in the body of the paper than mentioned in the keywords. The keywords list may need updating. The line spacing is not consistent throughout. It is smaller for the abstract and bigger for the body. If well reviewed, the overall page consumption of the article can be reduced. It is actually portrayed as 23. Plus make use of “Leave space after paragraph” instead of whole line wherever applicable. Review font sizes for “3.2 Estimation method” and “3.2.1 Unit root”. Despite being of different sub-levels, they are of same font sizes. In the document supplied to me, the paragraphs are not at all justified (left and right aligned). Kindly review.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>The language is appropriate, with suggestion to verify if English UK or US is enforced in the publication. As such, the writings in the manuscript have both</p> | |

Review Form 1.7

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| | Minor typos found- easily reviewable, e.g word "useage" in conclusion. Review overall using editor assistance/spell checks. | |
| Optional/General comments | Three usual sections of research are missing in this manuscript: 1. The assumptions applicable in this study. 2. Section on Evaluation/major or critical findings. 3. Future works identified. The section on Conclusion appears long. As such it is opening for further branches of study in the form of recommendations. It is suggested here to introduce a section on Recommendations before conclusion. Successively, section on conclusion must be reviewed, shortened and be more to the point. | |

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) |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Name: | Mohammad Kaleem Galamali |
| Department, University & Country | Université Des Mascareignes, Mauritius |