



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_3971
Title of the Manuscript:	Chasing the Whale: USU's Quest for Carbon Neutrality

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The paper has been improved significantly. Still there are some matters that have to be further clarified or improved. 1. The title refers to greenhouse gas emission reduction but the case study deals with the reduction of (on campus) energy consumption. The relation between the two should be clarified, as greenhouse gas emission reductions may also be achieved by reducing the carbon-intensity of energy inputs (while taking into account the life cycle greenhouse gas emissions of alternative energy supply options). This clarification should be early in paper. In this clarification it may also be pointed out that in achieving greenhouse gas emission reductions reduced energy consumption may well be more attractive than changes in energy supply in view of costs and in view of life cycle environmental burdens. 2. The clarification referred to under 1 may also be helpful for the discussion (section 4). Here the authors state: 'Although these efforts (use of less carbon intensive alternative energies) would reduce emissions they are not enough to reach carbon neutrality: reductions in consumption are also necessary'. As to this statement of the authors, it may be noted that the ACUPCC report they quote apparently refers to a 25% reduction in carbon footprint which is not the same as carbon neutrality. And when carbon neutrality is at stake (as it ultimately is in the case study) reductions in energy consumption would not be enough in the case of less carbon intensive alternative energies. For carbon neutrality the life cycle carbon intensity of the energy input should be zero. In that case a reduction of energy consumption would not be necessary. 3. The 2 models developed by the authors are not clearly explained. The text in this respect is moreover confusing. Below Table 3 (and again below Table 4.2) the authors suggest that they present their models in Table 3, but earlier (last sentence of the first paragraph of 2.2 the authors state that Table 3 presents the results of their base models (which seems to be correct). A clear description of the models used by the authors has to be included. 4. The first sentence of the second paragraph of 4 (discussions) seems to me grammatically incorrect. 5. I could find no legends to figures an tables. Maybe this reflects editorial policy, but if not legends should be added.	1. This is a good point – I have expanded the reasoning behind modelling consumption versus GHG emissions. Please see the additions in the fourth paragraph of section 1. 2. Another fair point. The referenced section has been improved per your suggestion. 3. We have made some minor adjustments that should clarify this section. Basically, we introduce two different models to control for determinants of energy use and present these models in Table 3. We then use both of the control or base models in the time series analysis in tables 4.1-4.2. The introductory paragraph in the Methods section makes this much more explicitly clear, and describes the method (standard OLS, then OLS with two types of time dependent variables) 4. Fixed 5. The legends do not seem necessary – all charts should be easily interpretable. If required, we can submit new figures.