

Paper: “Dynamic Effects of Energy Consumption and Economic Growth on CO2 Emission: Testing EKC Hypothesis in Africa”

Submitted: 19 May 2023

Accepted: 04 October 2023

Published: 31 October 2023

Corresponding Author: Suleiman Saad

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n28p127](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n28p127)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Fjona Zeneli
University of Milan, Milano, Italy

Reviewer 2: Georgios I. Farantos
University of Peloponnese, Korinthos, Greece

Reviewer 3: David Ndolo
Tufts University, USA

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

I personally think that the title is too much plain, not emphasizing the motivation of the work: to identify causality, cointegration, or just correlations between the variables. Moreover, there are included “panel data analysis” keywords, but in reality, what emerges from the methodology, is that it was done a multiple OLS, after some non-sufficient tests in the context of the panel data, and then for each country, it was provided a multiple OLS regression in the context of the panel approach. I believe the title can create false expectations.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

“...to test the Environmental Kuznet’s Hypothesis using data from 23 African countries for the period 1980–2019 in the Pedroni approach to panel cointegration analysis” is the motivation expressed by the authors. Then it is followed by “...however, in most countries, as income increases, the level of emission declines consistently with the EKC hypothesis.” This is a strong statement; we are talking about 23 developing countries, which may lead us to think that they are in the first phase of the EK hypothesis, the turning point is not reached yet (Fig.1. Source: Panayotou, 1993). The methods used are not mentioned (just the Pedroni approach). And the recommendations suggested are too much general and do not reflect the findings of the paper.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are some typos in the content (CO2 for CO₂, equiverlents for equivalent, fixe for fixed, test do not count for test does not count, kwon for known, etc.,), double spaces or tables and figures’ captions are not well formulated or are not complete in describing how the data are displayed, the units, the symbols used, the level of significance for every test result or coefficient reported. Personally, I see the used language style as the main flaw, not too explanative, general, and too fragmented.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

I have to disagree. The methods are superficially described, the legend after every equation is missing, what are the symbols used are not explained. At the end of the empirical part is used an individual panel OLS approach for each country, the theoretical part of it is missing.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The structure is an attempt to follow the classical one of an empirical paper. However, the content lacks some formal attributes. For example, the section of the literature review includes too many authors that have explored the topic but used different conceptualized approaches, or methodology or found different results. I do not see the justification why to include them in the paper, they are not comparable with your work (if author X studied the causality for the topic, why mention his work since you didn't follow the same approach?). You should limit mentioning similar works (in terms of topic, research design, and findings) with your work.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusions are not well described and listed; moreover, I fail to see a link between the empirical results of the paper, the conclusions, and the policy implications and recommendations formulated.

Suggestions such as "...finally, it must be emphasized that for all the countries, market-based incentives such as soft loans and tax holidays aimed at increased the consumption of renewable energy and less carbon-intensive activities can boost economic growth to reach the turning point where the association between energy consumption and growth will become inverse..." are not appearing in the literature review, nor in the empirical findings. Statements like this sound unvalidated with the data of the paper (a proxy for renewable energy is not included in the empirical analysis).

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

It includes papers not too much (or at all) related to the work as I stated also about the literature section above.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

What I can suggest is as follows:

We have a well-known hypothesis, widely explored in the literature, aimed to be validated using the data of 23 African developing countries for a period of time from 1980 to 2019.

I do not find a well-structured, complete, research design that can be used to produce some valid results that are the base of some strong policy implications.

I suggest reconsidering the research design used.

Reviewer E:
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title describes exactly the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The article contains a well-written abstract. However, the abstract could follow a clearly structured style (including Purpose – Data Source - Study design - Data Collection/Extraction Methods – Main findings – Conclusions – Keywords).

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Good use of grammar and spelling. A very few mistakes. E.g., Panel contrgration, Cointegration and VEC.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

State what the expected conclusions will be if the hypothesis is verified.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Separate the discussion from the results.
The findings are adequate but mixed with the discussion stages.
You must completely separate the two: results, discussion.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

You do not need to provide additional commentary or critique of the literature review – you will have done this in the literature review chapter.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

APA style is more appropriate for formal writing.
There are several types of writing.
The manuscript cited several references. A modern reference system, like APA Style, would be preferable but not necessary.
There are several styles of references.
Some references follow the APA system (in text), while others use a different style.
In some literature references the dates in brackets are heterogeneous
References are heterogeneous

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The abstract could follow a clearly structured style (including Purpose – Data Source - Study design - Data Collection/Extraction Methods – Main findings – Conclusions – Keywords).

State what the expected conclusions will be if the hypothesis is verified.

Separate the discussion from the results.

The findings are adequate but mixed with the discussion stages.

You must completely separate the two: results, discussion.

You do not need to provide additional commentary or critique of the literature review – you will have done this in the literature review chapter.

There are several types of references.

The manuscript cited several references. A modern reference system, like APA Style, would be preferable but not absolutely necessary.

In some literature references the dates in brackets are heterogeneous

References are heterogeneous.

Reviewer H:

Recommendation: See Comments

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Conventionally, people have used economic growth but they can use "Economic Performance" especially when carrying out panel analysis. That not to say we can not retain the topic they way it is.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The important aspects of the abstract have been met in this paper.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The grammatical errors include there repetitions of words like "key words " in the first page.

All the sections should be made bold to be like Introduction is not bold

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Methodology looks good. However, all the components of the model and the equations should be explained for clarity.

State the data sources clearly

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Proof read to ensure that commas and full-stops are placed in the right places in the paper

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The summary is good and conclusive

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Be sure to check all the references to ensure they are well captured to include author, year, issue ,topic as per the APA standards.Most of them seem in order

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the **BODY** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the **CONCLUSION** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the **REFERENCES** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
