Corresponding Author: Noor Alam

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Noman Saeed
University of Karachi, Pakistan

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr Noman Saeed	
University/Country: Applied Economics Research Centre (AERC), University of Karachi, Pakistan	
Date Manuscript Received: 25 – 12 – 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 20 – 01 – 2023
Manuscript Title: Moral Hazard Problem In Public Policy Makers	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: **Yes**	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: **Yes** You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: **Yes**	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**5**
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	**X**
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: