

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_129499
Title of the Manuscript:	Revisiting Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC) and Renewable Energy Consumption in India
Type of the Article	

#### PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The manuscript contributes to the growing field of EKC hypothesis literature.</li> <li>Energy is a pressing concern, and all studies related to this are relevant.</li> <li>A perspective from the developing world, like India, needs to be showcased to the academic community for inclusion and for evidence-based policymaking.</li> </ul>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The title of the manuscript is suitable, concise, and straightforward.</li> </ul>	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The abstract of the manuscript is comprehensive, but it needs to be improved via the inclusion of thought and phrasal connectors. It needs to be more flowing and cohesive.</li> </ul>	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The manuscript draws a lot of general conclusions but the methods utilized need to be strengthened before it can be concluded as scientifically correct. It employs time-series variables; and thus, time-series techniques need to be employed.</li> </ul>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incorporate the following papers in the Review of Related Literature, Introduction, and Methodology:</li> <li>Ponce, B. J. H., Manlangit, A. T. (2023). Carbon dioxide emissions and the Environmental Kuznets Curve: evidence from the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. <i>Environmental Science and Pollution Research</i>, 30, pp. 100037–100045. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-023-29370-3">https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-023-29370-3</a></li> <li>Ponce, B. J. H., Garcia, Y. T., Cuevas, A. C., Carnaje, G. P. (2022). Pollution emissions and economic growth in Asia through the lens of the Environmental Kuznets Curve. <i>Journal of Economics, Management &amp; Agricultural Development</i>, 8(2), pp. 77-93. <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.22004/ag.econ.342305">http://dx.doi.org/10.22004/ag.econ.342305</a></li> </ul>	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The language utilized in the manuscript is almost suitable for scholarly communication and publication.</li> <li>• Certain prepositions and pronouns need to be corrected.</li> <li>• Don't contract phrases like "they've." Instead, write "they have"</li> <li>• Subject-verb agreement needs to be improved in some parts of the text.</li> </ul>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a well written manuscript. Kudos to the author(s).</li> <li>• There are instances wherein personal pronouns are used. See the second sentence in 1. Introduction, i.e., "According to him." Change this and all other similar parts of the text to directly cite the author, e.g., According to Yandle et al. 2002, etc.</li> <li>• The reference study for the EKC hypothesis is published in 2002. Consider citing a more recent study.</li> <li>• Refer to the EKC hypothesis as the "EKC hypothesis" and not just "EKC"</li> <li>• YOY growth rate and CAGR aren't relevant and are not necessary in addressing the objective of finding out whether the EKC hypothesis holds. Consider dropping these parts of the text.</li> <li>• OLS is very weak in establishing evidence supporting the validity of the EKC hypothesis. Consider estimating dynamic models.</li> <li>• Also, the sample size is immensely small. Expand/increase the sample space to ensure more robust estimations.</li> <li>• Since we're dealing with time-series variables, the inclusion of robustness checks and pre-regression estimates like unit root tests etc. are necessary. Incorporate these.</li> <li>• The recommendations drawn do not directly connect with the findings. These have to be connected and should not be just generally stated out of nowhere.</li> </ul>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i></p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Brian Jason H. Ponce</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Development Academy of the Philippines, Philippines</b></p>