

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_130405
Title of the Manuscript:	Interplay of Macroeconomics and CO2 Emissions Dynamics: Evidence from Top CO2 emitting Economies
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. The statement made by the author in lines 27-31 by the author should be justified by a citation/reference).</p> <p>2. The study was not based on any theoretical framework</p> <p>3. Poor explanation of the variables used in the study (see the five last lines on page 3 under the sub-head: materials and methods)</p> <p>This sentence is too long and contains many elements, making it difficult for readers to follow. It would be clearer if it were broken up into smaller, logically grouped sentences. The following suggestions would help: • Break the sentence into smaller, manageable parts; • Use precise and consistent language; • Explain the role of each variable; • Improve readability and logical flow.</p> <p>In addition, the author should confirm and justify the use of these variables by previous studies.</p> <p>4. The model of the study was not specified nor did it mirror any existing study</p> <p>5. The study made mention of unused data estimation techniques</p> <p>After analyzing the paragraph, it appears that neither the Generalized Method of Moments (GMM) nor the fixed-effects model techniques were expressly addressed or implemented. The text does not provide any evidence that GMM or fixed-effects model approaches were utilized. The emphasis is on a time-series VAR model that is backed by variance decomposition analysis and impulse response functions.</p> <p>6. Other issues</p> <p>Panel VAR/VECM model should be specified by the author</p> <p>The author should state and justify the use of GMM and fixed effect model in the study</p> <p>Apart from the descriptive statistics analysis, the study did not examine the stationarity of the series, nor check to determine if long run relationship exists in the model. This would have enabled the author to decide on the right regression technique to use for the study.</p> <p>The study is supposed to be a panel data study. however, the analytical procedures portrays a time series data analysis. The author should go back and do a panel data analysis using any suitable techniques based on the characteristics and stationarity of the data used in the study.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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)</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>Chukwudi Emmanuel Edeh</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Enugu State University of Science and Technology, Nigeria</p>