



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_5042
Title of the Manuscript:	HYDROGEN STRATEGIC COMPLEMENT OF OIL, COAL, GAS AND RENEWABLE ENERGY
Type of the Article	Research Paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This manuscript does not provide a clear novelty and contribution. The focus is unclear due to several details, which does not provide clear value-added to the literature. Assumptions and limitations of the study are poorly explained. Missing is section on data used. There are missing implications. The manuscript is also poorly structured and poorly written. There are several mistakes, which need very substantial revisions and editing,	The motivation to write this article, is the following: in many oil and hydrogen conferences I have attended to, or the oil companies nor the government presented evidence of possible oil crisis. Worse yet, nor have international repercussions analysis using modern approach such as Game Theory and Real Options in calculations of supply and demand for oil, energy and hydrogen. In this sense this paper is unique. The written was revised. Section 2.1 was re-structurated.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There is no need to write the titles of papers in the text. Therefore, references in the text do not meet academic standards. Several formulas used need better explanation why they are used? Without the data used section and clear explanation of variables Tables, which are often without titles and any	That is clear, we use in this version academic standards. Today, all Figures, Tables and equations have explanation and have a number.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	explanation, are difficult to follow. The same holds for presented Figures. Section on conclusions is repeating some parts of the text, but does not provide clear findings.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This manuscript is too general without a clear novelty and contribution for economics, management and trade.	