



SDI Review Form 1.6

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 the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: 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	Line 8-14: If energy trade liberalization has a large long run impact on environment quality, what is the nature of this impact (positive or negative)? To what extent has each of the 4 components contributed to the overall impact? Line 15-22: Findings on market integration are broadly reported. The substance or nature of energy market integration has not been clearly indicated. Line 56-61: Which study? Do proper citation and referencing. Line 62-68: Source/reference? Where do ASEAN countries import oil from? Line 32-84: There is need to (i) state clearly what the HAPUA energy-environment policy? (ii) give the map of the ASEAN countries' energy map (supplying and consuming countries by type of energy, the structure/breakdown of total energy supply in the region by type of energy, and rate of energy dependency by country) Line 110-112: Recall the ASEAN energy-environment policy and the extent to which each country has abided to it so far. Line 123-126: which trade? Need to specify energy trade, otherwise these hypotheses would take the study out of focus. Line 137-139: 'CO2 emissions' is not appropriate measurement of environmental pollution accruing from all types of energy. There may be a need to distinguish fossil (fuel) and non-fossil energy, as to their link with CO2 emissions. That's why the structure of energy supply is required, to assess differential impact of each energy source on environmental pollution. Other measurements of environmental degradation that are specific to energy type or source may need to be explored. Line 140-141: recall/list the variables to be correlated. Strive to do this by each of the components of energy liberalization (trade, market, infrastructure, pricing). Line 186-188: Why are the columns 'gas' and 'coal' put twice with different data. Specify if these are 'reserves' and 'production' as for oil. Provide % share of production to reserves, and averages for ASEAN countries. Line 156-210: The text on energy is too descriptive. Focus on the structure of the	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	energy supply by source and explain the key differences among ASEAN countries and between them and other countries. Indicate the key supply-side and demand-side factors that explain such differences. Line 212-464: The presentation of study results is too descriptive. One would expect that authors show the findings from the calculation of suggested correlations. Even better, regression analysis would need to be done at three level: 1- between energy supply-side factors and growth 2- between energy consumption by type and level of environmental degradation/pollution, including among explanatory variables dummies for energy liberalization (trade, market, infrastructure, pricing) Line 466-472: The conclusion is too long and lacks focus. It does not accrue from substantive quantitative research findings. If authors cannot perform quantitative analysis, key findings related to each research objectives or hypothesis should be made clear.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	36-37: pay attention to typing errors (word gluing). Do this throughout the text. 47-48: why parallel government? Is there not, regularly elected president who elected an official government?	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The study is too descriptive. It addressed to many issues and market-related concepts at a time. It lacks a quantitative drive in the methodology, and its findings remain descriptive and cannot be substantiated by clear test of the formulated hypotheses.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Barthelemy G. Honfoga
Department, University & Country	Dept. of Agricultural economics and rural sociology, University of Abomey-Calavi, Benin