

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Energy Research and Reviews</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JENRR_114403</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Revisiting the nexus between renewable energy consumption and economic growth in Nigeria: The VECM approach.</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</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</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1- The abstract needs to be reorganized and should highlight obviously the innovative aspect of the study.</p> <p>2- Introduction is very long and it can be better motivated. What is the real contribution of this work compared to the existing studies? What are the gaps in the existing literature.</p> <p>3- The literature review reports several works; however, it is not clear how to place the author's contributions concerning this literature? The analysis is quite simple.</p> <p>4- The introduction and literature review sections should be re-directed to the article objective. These sections should support what are doing in the empirical part.</p> <p>5- Policy and practical implications section needs to be strengthened.</p> <p>6- The research limitations and directions for future research should be stated.</p> <p>7- The authors failed to address well the comparison of their findings to the existing articles on the same subject.</p> <p>8- The choice of the control variables should be justified.</p> <p>9- The authors use only ADF test. They must use at less two stationary tests to verify the stationarity of variables.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>Somes others comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Page 4 where is model M2?? "The efficiency of the energy economy has been found to be significantly impacted by the combination of resources from the second model (M2)."</li><li>- Paper should be numbered</li><li>- All abbreviations should be defined.</li><li>- There is no a link between section.</li><li>- Table 1 is bad presented</li></ul>	
--	---	--

**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:	Rafik Jbir
Department, University & Country	ESSEC, University of Tunis, Tunisia and College of Administration and Economy, Tunisia, Ummul Qura University, Saudi Arabia