SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SCIENCEDOMAIN

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	It is recommended that the submission "Hydrogen Strategic Complement of Oil, Coal, Gas and Renewable Energy" NOT BE PUBLISHED in the Journal. This recommendation is based on the following observations of the manuscript: 1. The manuscript is extremely disjointed, and is not clear what the objective of the paper is, what methods are being used, what is the basis for mathematical analysis and in general what the paper sets out to accomplish. 2. The authors start by asking a question about the possibility of living in a stable equilibrium between nature, oil companies and man. What do they mean by stable equilibrium? Later on in the introduction they talk about multiplicative holistic relationship. Again, the reader is left at sea to figure out what they mean. 3. Authors talk about Poland's power industry	

	being dependent upon obsolete technology. Elaborate. 4. Fuel cells always consume fuel, not generate hydrogen. The authors should use the terminology electrolytic cell when hydrogen is being produced. 5. Hydrogen's intrinsic advantage (page 2): explain properly, it is not clear what the advantages are. 6. LNG is mentioned on page 3. Are the authors trying to compare hydrogen and LNG? The entire section is loosely written and out of focus. 7. Authors start presenting equations on page 4. These equations are not explained clearly, nor is the numbering system understandable. 8. Authors present a large number of equations, none explained in detail. Anytime mathematical analysis is presented, one should not stop at final form of equation, but explain the physical significance of the terms and the result. This is particularly jarring in the calculation of elasticities. What do the	

	equations signify? 9. A large section of the paper is devoted to decisions regarding investing and oil resources. The tables are barely readable, and the games may be interesting, but this information does not contribute to the focus of the paper, which, presumably is hydrogen. 10. Authors come back to hydrogen in a brief para on page 17, but again do not explain the significance. The authors have a surplus of material, perhaps they should not attempt to lump everything in one paper. The ideas are simply not developed in a concise manner, and the value of their analysis will not be conveyed by publication of this manuscript.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer