SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

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**

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	1. Ultimately the focus of the paper appears to be on on-campus energy consumption (line 293 ff) . Past on-campus natural gas and electricity consumption are given in figure 1. The unit used is not a standard unit (Joule). It is not clear whether in figure 1 the consumption of electricity is calculated in terms of primary energy used for electricity production. To make the link with greenhouse gas emissions (which are very important up to line 288) there should moreover be a subsequent step which includes the differences in greenhouse gas emissions for the power plants and the changes therein over time. The latter is absent in spite of the claim that the authors will test the effect of USU policies 'on actual GHG emissions or carbon footprints' (line 261-262). 2. The methods section and the results section are severely deficient and do not provide the transparency needed in a scientific paper. 'Our model' (line 316) and the data sets used (and the quality thereof) remain	

	unexplained. Legends to tables 1 & 2 are missing. So e.g., though the authors stress that 'climate is a large determinant of energy use' (line 93 ff), it remains completely unclear which set of weather data they have used in which way and what 'energy use days' means. 3. The authors state that their analysis shows that the cause of the failure to reduce energy consumption is that: 'leaders making policy and signing pledges at colleges and universities will not be around long enough to make sure those policies are implemented' (line 361- 364). The authors do not prove this at all: they rather seem to feel that this is so. If they had taken a good look at the available scientific literature they might have noted examples of successful school/university energy efficiency programs elsewhere in the US (e.g. Fuller & Sullivan Energy and Buildings 1 (1977/1978) 401-413; McLelland & Cook 5 (1983) 213-217; Fachoux et al. ASHRAE Transactions 115 (2009) 519-530). Comparing those programs with what has happened at the USU would seem a better basis for finding the cause(s) of the apparent failure of energy conservation on the USU campus than stating causes without proving them.	

	4. As to the period up to 2050 the authors assume that 'no significant shifts in technology will occur' (line 349). This is a highly unrealistic assumption and neglects e.g. emerging options for improved energy efficiency, solar energy and seasonal storage of hot and cold water which seem to become increasingly feasible in terms of technology and cost and also have been studied in the context of other universities/schools (e.g. Gomez-Amo et al. Renewable Energy 29 (2004) 675-685; Kalkan et al. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews 15 (2011) 2940-2959; Hong et al. Journal of Management in Engineering 28 (20012) 39-50; Al-Dabbas & Al Roussan Energy Conversion and Management 65 (2013(744-750). 5. Lines 31- 259 might be considered introductory. As an Introduction these lines lack focus and are severely under-referenced. In a proper Introduction to a study of the effects of efforts to improve on-campus energy efficiency (as reflected in the results section of the paper), the authors should have considered existing scientific literature focussing on this subject. This they did not do.	

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**L. Reijnders**
Department, University & Country	**IBED, Science Faculty, University of Amsterdam, Netherlands**