SDI Review Form 1.6

----Original Message----
From: XXX YYY<xxx@yyy.zzz>
Sent: Thu, Jul 25, 2013 at 1:35 AM
To: Managing Editor
Subject: Re: Request for evaluation of revised paper, reference number: 22013_BJEMT_3971

The author significantly revised the paper and the analysis with better explanations about energy consumption. Although the results are not as good as expected, it could be published at BJEMT. The theoretical explanations in part 1 is fine but, the correlations and abbreviations should be included as appendix before it is published.

So my degree to this document is: Accept

Note: Anonymous Reviewer

Note: Modification was done in this email ONLY to hide the identity.

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	**This article examines whether the energy consumption per square foot could change in the Utah State University after the Climate Action Plan of Utah State in 2010. From the author's words in evaluating sustainability programs in Utah State University part, it is not clear which measures the university hold now to develop carbon neutrality. The author(s) should define the carbon goals of the university briefly without referencing too many details in past such as 1970 crisis. He/she should document the latest carbon footprint measures of USU:** **1) What is the amount of emission reduction percentages is accepted as a goal of the university?** **2) How do they measure carbon footprint in the university?** **3) Does the author(s) propose the carbon offsets as a solution?** **Regarding the analysis results, Energy Consumption and Energy Use may have in high *correlation* that causes significant effects on the OLS model rather than student number and square foot. The author(s) should put correlation table to the results and clarify the measures of energy efficiency policies of the university or test these conservation measures specifically in another way. Do they have a data about**	

	the green efforts of the university and sustainability measurements? The author depends only on the on-campus energy consumption on the analysis although he/she intends to test the effect of carbon neutrality efforts. **Why do you select 1998-2010 periods in the analysis? Please define in the data part.**	

Minor REVISION comments	In the study, the literature part does not probe the energy efficiency measures enough. For the carbon footprint measurements, the author(s) may cite from the below articles: Gian Luca Baldo, Massimo Marino, Marco Montani, Sven-Olof Ryding, The carbon footprint measurement toolkit for the EU Ecolabel, The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment, November 2009, Volume 14, Issue 7, pp 591-596 Matthias Finkbeiner, Carbon footprinting—opportunities and threats, The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment March 2009, Volume 14, Issue 2, pp 91-94, Figure 2 and 3 should not be installed in the discussion part. The CAP strategies that aim to decrease energy consumption could be emphasized more.	
Optional/General comments	• The abbreviations should be listed at the end and in the article. There are lots of abbreviations in the article which seems blur. • The introduction contains ironic and literary terms: "how to take them have become near religious in their pitch and timbre". • Change this sentence: "The sum of our analysis suggests the Utah State University's ambitious goals regarding carbon emissions are one such *as politically expedient statements translating into meaningless or detrimental policy*." • Change these "no" type words: "No general scientific measurement or no standard" • Numbering the parts of the study is needed, that	

	one part should evaluate the literature clearly and the other part focuses on the USU's quest for carbon neutrality. • Explanation for figure 1 is needed. Seasonally adjusted data can be covered in here. • Definitions of the variables should be placed under table 1 as a note or explanation in the text. • The author should answer this question in the conclusion part: How carbon offsets will lead the carbon neutrality in USU? • In the sources part, you do not need the internet address that takes more than five rows; if the article is pressed in a known scientific journal.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer