



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Assessing Morocco's Transition to a Green Economy: An Indicator-Based Analysis (2010–2020)”

Submitted: 14 July 2025

Accepted: 25 June 2026

Published: 30 June 2026

Corresponding Author: Meryam Bouayad

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n16p25

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Chorouk Drissi
Abdelmalik Essaadi University, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Georgios I. Farantos
University of West Attica, Greece

Reviewer 3: Satish Kumar
Dire Dawa University, Ethiopia

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

The title can be improved for clarity and precision. I suggest: “Assessing Morocco’s Development Model in the Era of Green Transition.”

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Abstract is clear

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

-The manuscript contains several grammatical and stylistic mistakes:
such as energy policies, water management, and biodiversity conservation "to be taken into account" : "to be considered" (Georgeson et al., 2017).
The Kingdom of Morocco faces "a number of": faces "several environmental challenges".
This table groups together the "normalised": "normalized" shows that thermal production accounted for "the overwhelming majority of": "most of" electricity generation.
few studies have systematically assessed "all of this" : "all this" progress at the national level..
-Decide whether to use UK English (standardising, normalised) or US English (standardizing, normalized).
-Sentence to rethink and reformulate : "At the heart of these issues is the need to rethink dominant economic paradigms, particularly that of growth at all costs".

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Methods are well explained

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

I recommend to include Study Limitations and Future Research Directions in the conclusion

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

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Several sources are still cited in French :Nahman et al., Vukovic et al. (2019), Niță et al., 2024,(Georgeson et al., 2017)....

Please ensure standardization and, where possible, prioritize English-language references for consistency.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

3

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]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- The manuscript refers to the Rio+20 Conference (2012) but omits COP22 (Marrakech, 2016), which represents a key milestone for Morocco's international climate engagement and should be included.
- The discussion is at times too general. I recommend incorporating a section on sectoral progress and achievements (e.g., in renewable energy, agriculture, water, and industry) to better illustrate Morocco's positive evolution in the green transition.
- The paper should also elaborate further on Morocco's economic development model, as this is essential to contextualize the analysis of its "greening."
- Finally, although you indicated that recommendations would be provided at the end, the article would benefit from a more explicit recommendations section, clearly outlining concrete policy directions and strategic priorities to guide Morocco's transition toward a sustainable green economy.

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title is good, however it can be more specific to the issue. Suggested title could be "Challenges in evaluation parameters of Morocco's green transition"

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes. Abstract is clear and specific

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

Yes. The English used is correct and very few errors in sentence formation

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes. The methods are clearly explained

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

Very few errors in sentence formation. These can be corrected

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

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

References are appropriate

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]

5

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):

Only minor correction needed in sentence formation. Appreciate if the Title is more clear as suggested. Good attempt , well done.

Always give the title of the figure (at the bottom) eg. Fig 1: (Source, Year) to be written below the picture/diagram (not above).

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title is clear, descriptive, and accurately reflects the content and scope of the paper. It includes the key elements of the study—green economy, Morocco, and sustainable development—making it easy for readers to understand the focus of the research.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract generally provides a coherent summary of the study, including the purpose, methodology, and main findings. However, it would benefit from greater clarity in describing the methodological approach—especially the nature of the index used and the validation process. Additionally, the term "IEV" should be defined upon first use.

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

Yes, there are a few minor grammatical issues and occasional awkward phrasing that should be corrected. The manuscript would benefit from light professional language editing to improve clarity, sentence structure, and flow. Examples include typographical errors and some overly long or dense sentences.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodology is outlined but requires further elaboration. The paper mentions the use of a composite index based on 13 indicators; however, it does not list or explain these indicators in the reviewed sections. The normalization and aggregation techniques should be clarified, and the process of weighting or validation must be more explicitly described.

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

The body is generally well structured and logically developed. The background and context are rich in detail, though some sections may be slightly long. The arguments are well supported. However, the paper would benefit from more detailed data presentation (e.g., tables or figures summarizing indicators or index trends) and minor revisions for clarity.

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

The conclusion aligns with the results and discusses relevant policy implications. However, it tends to be optimistic without acknowledging the methodological limitations in sufficient detail. The final paragraph could benefit from a more balanced tone, emphasizing both achievements and challenges.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The reference list is moderately comprehensive, including relevant international and national sources. However, the scientific literature cited is somewhat limited and includes several grey literature sources. The authors should ensure that all in-text citations appear in the reference list and vice versa. A few inconsistencies in citation format were noted.

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]

4

*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]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This paper addresses a relevant and timely topic and applies a structured approach to evaluating Morocco's progress towards a green economy. The use of a composite index to assess green transition is appropriate; however, several methodological elements need further clarification, especially regarding indicator selection, normalization, and validation. I recommend including a table listing the 13 indicators and elaborating on the aggregation method. A light language revision would also improve readability. With these minor improvements, the paper would make a valuable contribution to the literature on sustainable development in the MENA region. Additionally, integrate international benchmarks or comparisons (e.g., OECD or GGEI frameworks) to support your claim of "above average" performance.

Improve the writing quality by removing repetitions, shortening long paragraphs, and correcting grammatical issues. Lastly, consider expanding the discussion of social dimensions of the green economy (e.g., inequality, employment).

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Yes, the title is clear, specific, and accurately reflects the article's content and scop

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes, the abstract clearly outlines the objectives, methodology, and main results, though it could briefly mention data sources or limitations for completeness.

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

Yes, there are a few minor spelling and formatting errors (e.g., "Inetrnationale," "wasterecycling," comma instead of period in decimals), but they do not affect readability.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes, the study methods are clearly explained and logically structured. The authors detail the selection of 13 indicators, their alignment with national priorities, and the normalization and aggregation process used to build the Green Economy Index (GEI). The rationale for using the Vukovic et al. (2019) framework is well justified, and the formulas and rating scale are clearly presented. However, the section could be slightly improved by clarifying the weighting rationale and presenting formulas in a cleaner format

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

Yes, the body of the paper is well structured and flows logically from the introduction through the results and conclusions. The argumentation is coherent, and the transitions between sections are smooth. The use of subheadings and clear paragraphing helps readability. The data interpretation aligns with the stated objectives, and the discussion effectively links empirical findings to policy implications. Minor issues—such as inconsistent formatting, small typographical errors, and occasional redundancy do not affect the overall clarity or quality of the manuscript.

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

The conclusion accurately reflects the study's main findings and is well aligned with the results, but it remains somewhat descriptive. While it highlights Morocco's progress and structural challenges, it could engage more critically with the implications of the results, especially regarding policy effectiveness, data limitations, and the broader regional or comparative context. The recommendations are general rather than operational, and the discussion could be strengthened by addressing how future reforms might be prioritized or measured. Overall, the conclusion is sound but would benefit from deeper analytical reflection.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

ChatGPT Plus The reference list is generally comprehensive, but it lacks recent academic studies from 2023 and 2024. While several institutional reports from those years are cited, the inclusion of more recent peer-reviewed research would strengthen the paper's currency and situate it within the latest academic discussions on green economy assessment and sustainability metrics.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

4

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]

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):

The paper addresses a relevant and timely topic with a solid methodological foundation and clear structure. The assessment of Morocco's green economy transition is well contextualized and contributes valuable empirical evidence. However, the manuscript would benefit from several improvements:

- Enhance originality and analytical depth – Go beyond the application of Vukovic et al. (2019) by adding comparative or statistical analyses (e.g., cross-country comparison, sectoral correlations, or sensitivity testing).

- Update the literature review – Include more recent academic studies (2023–2024) to reflect ongoing debates in green economy measurement and policy evaluation.

- Improve technical consistency – Correct minor typographical errors (“Inetrnationale,” “wasterecycling”), unify index terminology (GEI vs. IEV), and use English decimal points.

- Refine the presentation of methods – Clarify the weighting rationale and improve the layout of equations and tables for readability.

- Strengthen the conclusion – Move beyond descriptive findings to provide more critical and

actionable policy implications.

- Standardize references – Apply APA 7 formatting consistently, avoid duplicates, and ensure complete publication details for institutional sources.

With these revisions, the paper could make a stronger and more rigorous contribution to the literature on green economy assessment and sustainable development in emerging economies.
