

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_83162
Title of the Manuscript:	Renewable Energy Consumption and Economic Growth in Uganda
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljenrr.com/index.php/JENRR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The major issue about the manuscript is its originality. The real contribution of the paper to the literature and this journal is unclear. There are several studies on this topic related to Uganda province that are easily accessible, yet these studies have not been visited in this study.</p> <p>E.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Apergis, N., & Danuletiu, D. C. (2014). Renewable energy and economic growth: Evidence from the sign of panel long-run causality. <i>International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy</i>, 4(4), 578.• Adams, S., Klobodu, E. K. M., & Apio, A. (2018). Renewable and non-renewable energy, regime type and economic growth. <i>Renewable Energy</i>, 125, 755-767.• Namahoro, J. P., Wu, Q., Xiao, H., & Zhou, N. (2021). The Impact of Renewable Energy, Economic and Population Growth on CO2 Emissions in the East African Region: Evidence from Common Correlated Effect Means Group and Asymmetric Analysis. <i>Energies</i>, 14(2), 312.• Namahoro, J. P., Nzabanita, J., & Wu, Q. (2021). The impact of total and renewable energy consumption on economic growth in lower and middle-and upper-middle-income groups: Evidence from CS-DL and CCEMG analysis. <i>Energy</i>, 237, 121536. <p>The methodology of this manuscript is not up to date. The data used in empirical application covers the period of 25 years and there are several other methodological approaches for this kind of long durations.</p> <p>The study definitely needs a proof reading. Some paragraphs are not well written and paper is not fluent for readers.</p> <p>Reference style is complicated. In the references the following up is really hard due to usage of varying citing styles.</p> <p>In the manuscript, the discussion part comes after the empirical application results which is stated as summary. It should be stated after the conclusion and cover the whole study with the opinions of the authors.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Tables and formulas should be revisited according to requirements.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mustafa Koç
Department, University & Country	Sakarya University, Turkey