Paper: **"The Impact of Economic Growth, Energy and Electricity Consumption Usage on CO2 Emissions: A Case Study of Morocco"**

Corresponding Author: Wafa Kerfal

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Lee Alubala
African Nazarene University, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Afzal Shah
Quaid-i-Azam University Islamabad, Pakistan

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The aspect of economic growth is missing from the title. The Co2 emissions have been defined in the article as the dependent variable while economic growth, electricity consumption and energy consumption as independent variable. This relationship between outcome and explanatory variables is not clear in the title.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
Yes
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
There are minimal errors but the researcher should proofread.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
Yes
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
Consider including empirical literature review on similar works done.
Check on the statistical significance of the income per capita variable as per the model
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
Yes, the conclusion is aligned to the results and the object of the study
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
No, some of the listed references have not been cited in the article e.g. Apergis N, Payne
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

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]
5

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]
3

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
Yes
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
Yes
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
Yes
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
Needs further improvement
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
More informative figures should be retained and less should be striked through.
Captions of tables are incomplete. References are too short and mostly old
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
To some extent
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
No
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):