



## SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

### PART 1:

|                          |                                                                      |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">British Journal of Economics, Management &amp; Trade</a> |
| Manuscript Number:       | 2013_BJEMT_5042                                                      |
| Title of the Manuscript: | HYDROGEN STRATEGIC COMPLEMENT OF OIL, COAL, GAS AND RENEWABLE ENERGY |

### PART 2:

| FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Authors' response to final evaluator's comments |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| <p>The author has addressed some of the concerns raised about the original submission. Some of the material has been entirely removed (such as Poland's power industry or LNG comparison), making the revision more focused. However, the resubmission still has the same characteristics as the original submission, and analysis presented is unclear.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The author states that Nash's equilibrium is used as the basis for the analysis. It was worthy of the Nobel Prize in Economics in 1994. However, the author needs to clarify exactly how the concepts were adopted to define the problem in his work. The application of the theory needs to be explained.</li> <li>2. The basic comment on the analysis in original submission was that a large number of equations are presented, none explained in detail. The revision does not address this concern at all. Again, to reiterate, the physical significance of the terms, and the resultant equations must be explained. It is not enough just to present an equation containing terms that are not even listed in a nomenclature section.</li> <li>3. The second comment on the paper is disjoint between various sections or topics covered in the paper. For example, the author talks about major initiative of ARPEL, without explaining what the initiative is. Within a paragraph he states U.S. Department of Energy position, and then moving on to cuts in greenhouse gas emissions.</li> <li>4. What was stated in the summary of the original review is also applicable here. The author has surplus material and information that is being lumped together. The result is not coherent enough to convey the value of his analysis.</li> </ol> |                                                 |

**Note: Anonymous Reviewer**