

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_83162
Title of the Manuscript:	Renewable Energy Consumption and Economic Growth in Uganda
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.journaljenrr.com/index.php/JENRR/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The author (s) must review the design of the manuscript in accordance with the requirements of the journal. The same applies to the list of sources used. It is also necessary to cite all references to these sources in the text to the requirements of the journal. I urge the author (s) to review articles already published in JENRR. 2. In paragraph 3.2, it would be appropriate to explain the choice by the author (s) of the list of variables listed in Table 1. 3. Section 4 seems short. It should correspond to the main points of section 3. At the same time there is another name for section 4. For example, "Empirical analysis". 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The annotation may need to indicate some numerical results of the study. In particular, present the results of the evaluation of the relationship between the authors of the indicators studied. 2. In paragraph 2.1, the content of the conservation hypothesis should be described in more detail. 3. In paragraph 4.2. the author (s) note that Uganda can achieve clean energy goals for sustainable development. It is not entirely clear how this statement follows from the conservation hypothesis. 4. It would be expedient to pay more attention to the issue of statistical significance of the obtained results. 	
Optional/General comments	The research topic is relevant. The author (authors) processed a significant amount of literature and statistical information. The author (authors) successfully use modern econometric methods. The objectives of the study can be considered achieved. I recommend the author (authors) when conducting further research in this area before building mathematical models to pay more attention to their justification from an economic point of view.	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Olexandr Yemelyanov
Department, University & Country	Lviv Polytechnic National University, Ukraine