

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_99791
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF ECONOMIC GROWTH ON CARBON DIOXIDE GAS EMISSIONS IN G20 COUNTRIES
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy> )

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Partially. The significance of the manuscript results from the confirmation by appropriate calculations of these that are commonly proclaimed, but not confirmed by data.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>3. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>5. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>6. <b>In my opinion there should be more references to the problem of climate change, GHG and CO2 emissions, as well as models used.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes. The language quality is good. However there the description of the figures should be made in English. The Author (Authors) should also pay attention to the official names e.g. United Kingdom vs England - these are not substitutes.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The paper is interesting and worth publishing. However minor amendments are needed. I've already mentioned above some language corrections. The methodology used and results obtained are made properly. The discussion section could be expanded. Especially some comments about countries which decoupled GDP and CO2 emissions are needed.</p> <p>Another question I have in relation to this article is why only CO2 is included. The research would be more valuable if other greenhouse gases would be included.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Konrad Prandecki</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Agricultural and Food Economics, National Research Institute, Poland</b>