

Paper: “The Impact of ESG Ratings on Investment Decisions in the Energy Sector During Uncertain Times”

Submitted: 26 August 2024

Accepted: 20 September 2024

Published: 30 September 2024

Corresponding Author: El Idrissi El Mahdi

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n28p165](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n28p165)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dishon Nyaga
Kenyatta University, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Róbert Szűcs
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

Yes the title is clear and relevant to the content's

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The objects are clearly outlined, but kindly outline the methods used and results

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

The article is perfect in terms of spelling and grammatical errors

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods used are clearly explained

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

The body is clear and does not have errors

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

The conclusion is accurate and supports the content

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references and citation is correct

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

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]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper is generally good and the content's explains the purpose of the paper, but kindly improve on citations and abstract.

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.

No, required to rewrite and show more the main results and the accurate methodology employed.

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

Yes, it requires proofreading

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes

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

Yes

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

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

No, needs to be checked.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

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]

4

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):

Reviewer F:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title, "Exploring the Impact of Environmental Social and Governance Ratings in Investment Decisions During Uncertain Times: A Focus on the Energy Industry," accurately reflects the article's content. It clearly indicates the focus on ESG ratings in the context of the energy industry. However, it could be slightly more concise.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract mentions the main topic and the rising importance of ESG in investment decisions. However, it lacks a clear breakdown of the study's objectives, methods, and concrete results. The abstract is slightly broad and could better summarize the methodological approach and key findings.

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

Overall, the grammar is clear and understandable, though there are minor issues, such as inconsistencies in tense and phrasing. For example, the abstract contains a few awkward sentences, such as "as global awareness of sustainability grows it's inevitable that the financial sector will have to adapt." These minor issues don't detract heavily from the readability.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The article explains the study methods in significant detail, particularly in the sections on econometric models and the Monte Carlo simulation. The methodology is well-structured, but there is some room for simplification, as parts of the explanation might overwhelm non-specialist readers.

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

The results, including statistical analyses and Monte Carlo simulations, are presented with clarity. However, the explanation of the results could be more concise, especially in the analysis of ESG factors in portfolio performance. There is a solid interpretation of the data, but the reader could benefit from additional visual aids or simpler language to convey complex results.

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

The conclusions are well-supported by the analysis presented in the article. The conclusion accurately reflects the findings that ESG ratings have a significant impact on investment decisions, particularly in uncertain times. The recommendations for future research are logical extensions of the current study.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The article uses a wide range of relevant and recent references, including studies on ESG ratings, financial crises, and econometric models. The reference list includes credible sources and a variety of perspectives, making it comprehensive and appropriate for the study.

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]

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]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

1. Clarify the abstract:

The abstract would benefit from a clearer outline of the study's objectives, methods, and key results. Consider including a brief mention of the specific methodologies used (e.g., econometric models, Monte Carlo simulations) and a summary of the main findings.

2. Simplify complex sections:

While the methodology is thorough, some sections (e.g., Monte Carlo simulations and econometric models) could be simplified or better explained for a broader audience. You might consider providing a brief overview of these methods for readers who are not specialists in financial modeling.

3. Improve flow and conciseness:

Certain sections of the paper could be more concise, particularly in the presentation of results. Reducing repetition and simplifying complex sentences will enhance

readability without losing the depth of analysis.

4. Minor grammar and phrasing adjustments:

There are minor grammatical issues throughout the article that can be addressed to improve fluency. For example, in the abstract, the phrase "as global awareness of sustainability grows it's inevitable that the financial sector will have to adapt" could be rephrased as "with increasing global awareness of sustainability, the financial sector must inevitably adapt." A thorough proofreading session would catch these minor issues.

5. Enhance visual aids:

The article includes useful statistical tables and graphs. However, adding more visual explanations (such as simplified charts for key findings or visual summaries of complex results) could make the analysis more accessible to readers, especially in the Monte Carlo simulation results section.

6. Strengthen the practical implications:

While the study focuses on the theoretical aspects of ESG ratings, a deeper exploration of the practical implications for investors or policy-makers could further enrich the discussion. Adding examples or case studies of how ESG criteria have been applied in recent energy sector investments might help readers relate to the real-world relevance of the findings.

7. Consider reworking the title:

Although the title is clear, it could be made more concise while still capturing the essence of the study. For instance, "The Impact of ESG Ratings on Investment Decisions in the Energy Sector During Uncertain Times" conveys the main theme succinctly.

These suggestions aim to help improve the clarity, impact, and accessibility of the research.
