



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJEMT/1673
Title of the Manuscript:	Carbon Dioxide Emissions, Energy Consumption and Economic Growth in Saudi Arabia: A Multivariate Cointegration Analysis.

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected' if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	The topic of the paper is very up to the recent development in the energy sector. From the methodological point of view the analysis seems quite rigorous and well designed, although there are some major methodological issues to stress.	Methodological issues have been resolved now
Specific comments:	a. It is unclear what the contributions the paper makes to our knowledge and policy discussion. The empirical question is interesting and policy relevant, but not new. Do the results differ from those in the literature qualitatively? If so, what are the policy implications then? b. In the unit root testing the author has to investigate the likelihood of possible breaks considering the sensitivity of this sector in development sin other sectors and/or the macroeconomic environment. c. The authors should explain some main opinions (maybe there is an error?). 1) It has been observed that higher economic growth causes environmental degradation and threatens the sustainability of the environment. It has been found that higher economic growth requires a higher level of energy consumption and is responsible for higher levels of CO2 emissions. 2) during the 1990s? Line35 3) Among the variety of polluting substances, CO2 is a major one ...Line45 4) Theory suggests that a preference for environmental considerations will cause economic growth and prosperity.	The Granger causality results support the neutrality hypothesis that there is no causal relationship exist between economic growth and energy consumption in Saudi Arabia, therefore Saudi Arabia's environmental friendly policy adopted since 2001 , to conserve and protect the natural resources and environment of the country, will not affect the growth process of the country. Unit root test is not perquisite for ARDL methodology Corrected Corrected This is a correct sentence Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.5

	Line81 d. There are some grammatical errors and instances of badly worded/constructed sentences. The manuscript should be edited for language.	The manuscript has been edited for language correction
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.5

Title and abstract	The authors should consider some choices of study perspectives and writing style carefully, especially in the abstract and introduction.	we have made some corrections
Introduction (<i>Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?</i>)	The objective of this study should be interpreted further.	The objective of the study is elaborated further.
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	The literature is not satisfying. The literature review now contains many details about the findings of the research cited, but it resembles a list of papers rather than a coherent and clear introduction to the research topic. What is the relation between the research topic and the list of papers, especially papers about EKC?	The literature cited in this study can be categorized into two sets 1. Economic growth CO2 emissions nexus and 2. the economic growth energy consumption nexus. The literature regarding the relationship between CO2 emissions and economic growth explain the existence or absence of EKC
Materials & methods (<i>Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work</i>)	The paper fails to articulate the complex relationship between the variables in Saudi Arabia. The authors should interpret the choices of the independent variables in the model, and why not include any other explanatory variables.	The choice of the variable included in this study is based on the assumption that economic growth is driven by high energy consumption that is likely to produce CO2 driven economic growth in the country. Many other study like Ozturk and Acaavci(2010) used same specification.
Results & discussion (<i>Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?</i>)	Please give complete results of estimation in table 3-5. Please give a stronger and neater message in the end of your estimates. In fact, implication of the empirical analysis is not so clear (maybe there is an error?)- The estimated long-run coefficients of CO2 emissions per capita are positive and significant and indicate that an increase in GDP will increase CO2 emissions per capita. (Line283) Thus, the results indicate that an additional increase in GDP will increase per capita CO2 emissions. (Line347) The long run estimated elasticity coefficient of CO2 emissions is positive and significant, implying that an increase in GDP will increase per capita CO2emissionsin the country. (Line 361)	All these observations are carefully checked and corrected wherever there was any error.
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?		
Conclusion (<i>Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only</i>)	The author has to add further discussion points and not just report the arithmetic results.	Further discussion is added
References	The authors should revise the reference style carefully. Some are missing from the list of references, such as Pesaran et al. (2001), shkoor (2010).	References are corrected