



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_28506
Title of the Manuscript:	ENERGY MARKET INTEGRATION AND TRADE LIBERALIZATION
Type of Article:	Review Paper

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Line 63-64: Authors wrote: “It clearly shows the widening of natural gas and hydro power since last few decades”. Observing carefully the figure, one would see that widening is less visible for hydro power than the three other sources. Widening was very/more substantial for oil and natural gas than hydro power. Average annual percentage growth by energy source over the period 1973-2011 may need to be calculated to confirm that observation. Line 72-73: Specify the unit of measurement of energy. Line 95-96: Indicate the sample size for each correlation coefficient calculated. Also indicate what “high” vs. “moderate” significance means with respect to critical levels. Significant at 5% level vs. 10% or 1% vs. 10%? Usually 1-5% is considered highly significant and 6-10% moderate. Beyond 10% is not significant. Line 508-509: Authors wrote: “trade has resulted in growth of these economies”. Can we still keep this conclusion when we now discover the negative correlation (-0.32) between trade and growth as shown in Table ...? If start and end of period data confirm parallel increase in both variables the positive relation may still be asserted, and the negative correlation may then be explained by discrepancies in data or un-congruent outliers in time series due to crisis and reform years, be they in the energy sector or not. I therefore invite authors to check and make the most appropriate remark in the discussion on the above table, before the conclusion section. Line 515-516: Reformulate as follows: “A simple correlation analysis has been used between trade and GDP Growth as linked with energy-generated pollution shows that there is a Moderate degree of Negative Correlation between trade and GDP growth, a high degree of positive correlation between trade & CO2 emissions and a high degree of positive correlation between GDP growth & CO2 emissions” Whole manuscript: All tables discussed in the text should be numbered consecutively and referred properly in the discussion.	Thank you for your valuable reviews. The changes have been made as advised. We have tried to mention the reasons of moderate negative correlation between trade and growth as analysed. The significance levels have been mentioned and accordingly the changes have been made in the conclusion section as well. Regards.