

Review of: "The Nexus between Energy Policies and Supply: A Descriptive Evaluation of Nigeria and UK Energy Sectors"

Maxwell Chukwudi Udeagha¹

¹ University of Johannesburg

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

RECOMMENDATION: MAJOR REVISION

The Nexus between Energy Policies and Supply: A Descriptive Evaluation of Nigeria and UK Energy Sectors

The paper attempts to descriptively evaluate the efficiency of policies designed by governments in Nigeria and the UK on energy supply. To this end, the authors used the descriptive statistics to present and analyze data while the policy analysis framework underpinned the study. Overall, the paper is interesting and exhibits good potential. However, it suffers from several deficiencies that need to be addressed before it can be accepted for publication.

1. Generally, the abstract of a paper is based on research aim/purpose, research method, and key findings. Abstract of this paper is well written but it is required to highlight the key findings of the study. Please revamp the abstract and make sure to include information as below, in order:

- Motivation
- Objective
- Data and method
- Results
- Implications

2. The Introduction fails to motivate the study. In the present form, it resembles a mini-review of literature, rather than discussing any policy-level problem. Why this study is necessary? What policy level problem this study is addressing? How is the study expected to provide any solution to that problem? How does the choice of sample is complementing that problem? Are the results and policies generalizable? The introduction is silent in all these aspects. The mere choice of new variables, new methods, or choosing a new context is not considered as contribution of a study. In the introduction section, the study should be positioned within the context of more contemporary literature. In this direction, more recent literature can be used to motivate the research question adequately. Meanwhile, the authors are strongly advised to derive the gap in which the study intends to fill from the existing literature. This section thus requires a thorough revision.

3. Originality: Structurally, this paper is well- written but lacks a well-established econometric methodology. Also, the most

critical issue that is grossly lacking in this paper is the motivation of this paper. Please justify why Nigeria and the UK? Hence, the background of the study should be strengthened with the issues centred on energy policies and supply, and it should be well justified why it is important to carry out this study in Nigeria and the UK?

4. What is the contribution of the document to the empirical literature? The authors can show how this study differs from other studies and also elaborate more on the contributions of this paper. Addition of more recent literature will make the work more relevant to readers.

5. Section 2 attempts to summarize the empirical literature. This section is very weak. The authors are advised to divide this section into three sub-sections. The first part should clearly illustrate the theoretical studies linking the variables under review. The second section should concentrate on empirical works between these variables. The last section should summarize the literature gaps. What is the aim of the review of literature? The authors merely listed out the studies without even creating a debate among them. Without that debate and thoughtful contradictions, the research gap cannot be substantiated. Also, the current literature appearing in this section is poorly written and outdated. We are in 2023. The authors should use only recent studies (i.e., 2020-2023 studies) in this section. Meanwhile, more can be done to reflect more comparison in the literature against other regions. For instance, in Europe, BRICS, Africa and Asia.

6. The authors neglect the significance of the study in the introduction section. Why? Several studies have been conducted regarding this topic at hand; therefore, it is crucial for the investigators to incorporate the novelty as well as the significance of the study.

7. In section 3 (methodology), the authors should use a well-established econometric methodology, and begin with the theoretical framework demonstrating how the chosen variables are related. The theoretical underpinning between these variables should be properly justified in this sub-section. The authors should provide a justification of the use of the variables chosen. For a well-established econometric methodology, the novel dynamic ARDL simulations model could be used to strengthen this section. To improve this section, the authors are invited to use the following papers and cite them.

(i) Can public-private partnership investment in energy (PPPI) mitigate CO₂ emissions in South Africa? Fresh evidence from the novel dynamic ARDL simulations approach. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, 10: 1044605 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2022.1044605>

(ii) Revisiting the nexus between fiscal decentralization and CO₂ emissions in South Africa: fresh policy insights. *Financial Innovation*, 9(1), 1-46. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40854-023-00453-x>

(iii) Can fiscal decentralization be the route to the race to zero emissions in South Africa? Fresh policy insights from novel dynamic autoregressive distributed lag simulations approach. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-023-25306-z>

(iv) Exploring the moderating role of financial development in environmental Kuznets curve for South Africa: fresh evidence from the novel dynamic ARDL simulations approach. *Financial Innovation*, 9 (1), 5. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40854-022-00396-9>

(v) Investigating the moderating role of economic policy uncertainty in environmental Kuznets curve for South Africa: Evidence from the novel dynamic ARDL simulations approach. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 29(51), 77199-77237. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-21107-y>

(vi) Dynamic ARDL Simulations Effects of Fiscal Decentralization, Green Technological Innovation, Trade Openness, and Institutional Quality on Environmental Sustainability: Evidence from South Africa. *Sustainability* 14: 10268. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su141610268>

8. The authors merely reported the results without even discussing the economic intuitions behind the results. Are these results supporting or refuting the existing policies in the chosen context? Are the results directed towards any new policy initiatives? The discussion of results should open up the threads of policy discussion, which is completely absent in this case. A mere comparison of the results with the literature doesn't ensure the novelty of the results unless they give out something new on the theory/policy front. Moreover, the discussion of results should be properly tied to past literature, and emphasis should be placed on how past studies either support or refute the findings of this study and why. Therefore, this section needs revision.

9. To improve the quality of this manuscript, the authors are invited to use the following papers to strengthen the introduction, literature review, methodology and results and discussion sections. These papers should be cited accordingly.

(a) <http://dx.doi.org/10.11130/jei.2018.33.1.1176>

(b) <https://doi.org/10.1080/15228916.2019.1584719>

(c) <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2022.1044605>

(d) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-022-00117-3>

(e) <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40854-023-00453-x>

(f) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-023-25306-z>

(g) <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40854-022-00396-9>

(h) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-21107-y>

(i) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-019-05944-y>

(j) <https://doi.org/10.1080/12265934.2019.1695652>

(k) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10644-020-09285-6>

(l) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10644-021-09368-y>

(m) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-17193-z>

(n) <https://doi.org/10.3390/su141610268>

(o) <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504509.2022.2123411>

(p) <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2022.985719>

(q) <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-419113/v1>

(r) <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2473>

(s) <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504509.2023.2183526>

(t) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41247-023-00110-y>

10. The policy implications of the results need more substantiation than what is currently stated in the paper.

11. The Concluding section frankly is a damp squib. It needs to be completely rewritten. It has to present a concise summary of the motivation of the paper, the methods used and the findings of the paper, their policy implications, and the assumptions / limitations of the analysis here.

12. It is vital that this manuscript is proofread by a native speaker of English Language to further strengthen easy readership.