



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

What drives carbon dioxide emissions in the long-run? Evidence from selected South Asian Countries

Ahmed, Khalid and Ur Rehman, Mujeeb and Ozturk, Ilhan

Sukkur Institute of Business Administration, Wuhan University of Technology, Cag University

10 January 2016

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/75420/>

MPRA Paper No. 75420, posted 05 Dec 2016 10:38 UTC

What drives carbon dioxide emissions in the long-run? Evidence from selected South Asian Countries

Khalid Ahmed

Sukkur Institute of Business Administration, Sukkur 65200, Pakistan.

Email: khalid.ahmed@iba-suk.edu.pk

Mujeeb Ur Rehman

Wuhan University of Technology, P.R China.

Email: m.rahmaan79@yahoo.com

Ilhan OZTURK

Corresponding author

Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences,

Cag University, 33800, Mersin, Turkey.

Email: ilhanozturk@cag.edu.tr

Abstract

This study empirically investigates the relationship between CO₂ emission and four of its potentially contributing factors (i.e., energy consumption, income, trade openness and population) using time series data from 1971-2013 on five selected economies of South Asia. After confirming that all the series are stationary using unit root test process, the study incorporates three different and advance panel cointegration tests i.e. Pedroni- Kao- and Johansen-Fisher-panel cointegration. All the panel cointegration tests confirm that all the variables cointegrated. The long-run association between the variables is checked using FMOLS-grouped and individual cross-section country in the panel. The FMOLS grouped results show that energy consumption, trade openness and population increases environmental degradation in the panel countries with exception of income which has negative impact and sounds the existence of Environmental Kuznet curve between income and emission. The innovative accounting approach using variance decomposition test and impulse response function is applied to examine the causality amongst the underlined vectors. The results show that there is bidirectional causality between energy consumption and trade openness and unidirectional causality running from energy consumption, trade openness and population to CO₂ emission. The results enumerate that the energy consumption and population density will increase in long-run and foresee further environmental degradation in the region.

Keywords: Carbon dioxide emissions; energy consumption; income; trade openness; population growth.

1. Introduction

In recent years, the relationship between economic growth and environment has been the most debatable topic in both development and environmental economics literature (Ahmed et al., 2016a,c). While considering the environmental consequence of economic growth, the trade-off between economic growth and environmental quality depends upon the optimal use of energy (Tan et al., 2015). Hence, the opportunity cost of opting either-increases, if the country is developing (Pearce et al., 2014). There is a wide range of literature available on growth-emission nexus, but the findings have been mostly inconclusive (Ahmed et al., 2016b). Consequently, this notion is becoming highly challenging for the policy makers unless empirical evidences are sufficiently robust and appropriate for policy use.

Since, the economic development has become the top most priority of developing countries, a major portion of their policies and efforts is also directed towards achieving such goal. Thence, over the few decades, the implications of such growth intensive exercise have resulted rapid economic transformation in many of the developing countries. Today, developing countries account more than 50% of world GDP and it is expected to rise to 60% by 2030 (OECD, 2014). Notwithstanding the various socio-economic policy reforms, trade openness has been common and the most compelling factor behind such economic growth performance (Ling et al., 2015). The benefits of trade liberalization are well established in economic theory dating back to Adam Smith's Comparative Advantage theory and the developing countries with open economic policies are the largest beneficiaries of trade liberalization (Edwards, 1992). Furthermore, the last few decades have observed the historic growth trend in global economy which is mainly associated with the trade openness in the form of agreements such as; WTO, NAFTA and ASEAN (See. Shadlen, 2005). Such agreements have made the flow of goods smooth- changing the composition of the total world industrial production. Over the last few decades, global economy has experienced a huge expansion in world aggregate demand and industrial output (Qazi et al., 2012). Such trends- no doubt produced great economic results for individual countries, however accompanied by some negative impacts especially on environment (Steinberg, 1997). As the global economy has transformed into an inorganic economy, it has resulted in global warming due to climate change.

Rapidly deteriorating environmental conditions is one of the biggest challenges that world is facing today. The ever rising world temperatures, the air-water-soil pollution, the changing pattern of rain are the signs of rapid environmental degradation and mainly associated with the industrialization (Ahmed et al., 2015). The sea level is rising and the threat of global warming is always hanging in the atmosphere. However, the projections are even worse. A recent World Bank report declared that world means temperature is expected to rise 4°C above the pre-industrial era. Heat extremes, sea-level rise, marine ecosystem, water availability, all have been projected to the dangerous level in the near future (World Bank, 2013). Scientific community unanimously declared greenhouse gases as the major cause of the global warming trend. Water vapor, nitrous oxide-N₂O, methane-CH₄, and Carbon dioxide-CO₂ are the major contributors of the greenhouse effect. Of these, water vapor acts as feedback to the climate as it increases the chances of rains. N₂O, CH₄ and CO₂ ethane, nitrous act as “forcing” of climate change as they block the heat from escaping the surface of the earth making the atmosphere warmer. Of these, CO₂ is the most abundantly found in the atmosphere and poses greatest threat to the environment. These greenhouse-gases (GHG) are produced through natural activities as well as through human activities including deforestation, use of fertilizers, biomass burning, and fossil fuel burning¹.

Environmentalists believe industrial revolution as the root cause of increased GHG

¹ For details see OECD Environmental Outlook to 2050. <http://www.oecd.org/env/indicators-modelling-outlooks/49846090.pdf> (Accessed 08.02.2016)

emission, which further results in global warming followed by extreme climatic events (Maslin, 2008). Energy being the life blood of modern industry and non-industrial sectors is the major source of emission (Ahmed, 2015; Shahbaz et al., 2013). The recent data using the comparative analysis between atmospheric samples held in ice-cores and more recent direct measurements, reveals that atmospheric CO₂ has substantially increased since the industrial revolution (NASA, 2014). Carbon dioxide information analysis center² reports that the per capita CO₂ emission has almost doubled since 1950 and similar trend is observed in global energy consumption. With such trends, research has been diverted in the last few decades to investigate the impacts of industrial revolution and economic growth on the climate change. Environmentalists are of the opinion that the production of enormous volume of industrial output requires the use of energy resources. The increase in energy consumption not only produces greenhouse gases, but also reduces the volume of non-renewable resources. Owing to highly energy intensive and fossil fuel driven, the establishment of new industrial units in developing countries largely compromise ecosystem. Therefore, the negative impacts of potential environmental degradation are more severe in developing and emerging countries than developed countries. Thus, investigating the effects of economic growth on environment in developing countries has become an important research topic for both growth and environmental economists.

The number of studies has been conducted on the relationship between economic growth and environment, with per capita income as proxy for economic growth and CO₂ emission as proxy for environmental degradation. Most of these studies test the Environmental Kuznet Curve (EKC) hypothesis. The EKC hypothesis suggests that the relationship between national income and environment is inverted-U shape. It means that the initial phase of economic development reduces the environmental quality, but after the certain threshold level, the environmental quality improves with increasing economic growth. The notable studies that evident such relationship are- (Grossman and Krueger, 1994, Takeda and Matsuura, 2006, Suri and Chapman, 1998, Lopez, 1994; Shahbaz et al., 2013; Shahbaz et al., 2014; Shahbaz et al., 2015; Apergis and Ozturk, 2015; Al-Mulali et al., 2015a; Ahmed and Ozturk, 2016). The rationale behind EKC hypothesis is that economic growth brings technological changes which introduces more environmental friendly techniques of production (Takeda and Matsuura, 2006) and that with high income, citizens demand for cleaner environment leading to strict environmental regulations (Grossman and Krueger, 1994).

Other studies have been conducted to test the causal relationship between economic growth and environmental degradation adding more variables like energy consumption, trade openness, urbanization and population (Farhani and Ozturk, 2015; Al-Mulali and Ozturk, 2015). Some studies have used data from individual countries while others used cross country data from different regions. Data from developed countries show that the environment has improved in the last few decades and emissions decreased (Brock and Taylor, 2005), however the developing countries have showed mixed results. A possible reason for this can be that the developing countries have not achieved the level of economic development yet that induces a cleaner environment. However, developing countries have the opportunity to learn from history and to divert their attention to combating environmental degradation in the early stage of their development. Such awareness can help low income countries to develop policies for a cleaner yet environmental friendly production (Grossman and Krueger, 1994). The increasing research on the topic has already changed the approach of the growth economists and governments to consider environmental concerns while making development policies (Brock

² CDIAC, report available at: <http://cdiac.ornl.gov>

and Taylor, 2005). Hence, it necessitates further investigations on developing countries that would be helpful in explaining the relationship of economic growth and the environment.

This study aims to investigate the growth-environment nexus in case of selected five South Asian countries (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal and Sri Lanka). Because, South Asia is a home of 21% of global population, accounts 4% of global GDP, shares 6% of global energy consumption and contributes 3% to total world merchandise exports (World Bank, 2014). However, region's annual GDP is expected to grow at 8% and energy demand is projected to rise at 7.4% annually till 2020³. The competing growth rate between two indicators shows that the regional gross domestic production is highly energy intensive and this notion further caution about the emission potential of the industries. Figure-1 illustrates the trend in the variables and graph of each cross-section country depicts strong positive correlation between GDP, CO₂ emission, energy consumption (EN), trade openness (TR) and population density (POP). However in recent years, the region has faced frequent natural disasters. For example: in 2004, South Asian tsunami affected 7 countries and killed more than two hundred thousand peoples; the 2008 earthquake in Pakistan followed by two floods in 2010 and 2011- making 10 million people homeless, and recent earthquake in Nepal killed around 9000 people⁴. Moreover the financial loss, health risks and future projections of climate change impacts are far intimidating. The consecutive natural and calamities and changing biodiversity has raises several questions for both environmental and development economists. The recent and projected emission trend forecasts more severe climatic changes and their negative repercussions on ecosystem. The future economic loss from such negative may exceed the threshold level.

³ Projections are made by Asian Development Bank (ADB) and the percentage is compounded growth rate.

⁴For detailed analysis see. UNESCAP report available at:
http://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/Technical%20paper-Overview%20of%20natural%20hazards%20and%20their%20impacts_final.pdf




Figure 1: Trend in the variables

This study uses time series data from five selected countries of South Asia (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and Nepal) to empirically investigate the relationship between CO₂ emissions and four of its potentially contributory factors i.e. energy consumption, income (GDP), trade openness and population. All the countries are developing economies and in transition to industrialization. In such phase of economic development, countries tend to increase their energy consumption to match up with the demands of new industries. However, the study of countries in their initial stage of development is important in order to understand their pattern of CO₂ emission. Developing countries have the opportunity to learn from the history of developed countries and to divert their attention to combat environmental degradation at the early stage of their development. Such awareness can help low income countries to develop policies for a cleaner environment (Grossman and Krueger, 1994).

The rest of the paper is organized as: section 2 presents a brief review of literature on the subject. Section 3 provides detail of the data and explanation of the model used. Section 4 produces the results and provides policy suggestions in both the group and individual context. Section 5 concludes the findings.

2. Literature Review

The study of relationship between economic growth and environmental factors is not a

new topic. Economists have studied the impact of environmental factors such as the use and availability of fossil fuels and other industrial inputs on economic growth since the early ages of industrial revolution (Shafik and Bandyopadhyay, 1992; Jänicke et al., 1989). Economists viewed the limited capacity of natural resources as a hurdle in the path of economic growth (Brock and Taylor, 2005) and tried to find new sources of industrial inputs in order to boost production. However, industrial revolution has transformed the global economy from being organic to inorganic while increasing the per capita consumption of fossil fuels (Stern et al., 1996). The increased fossil fuel consumption has led to the increased level of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere resulting in global warming and climate change (Kasman and Duman, 2015). The Growth-Environment literature sought meaningful attention after the Earth's summit 1992. Ever since, the research on the subject has grown and today a vast literature exists both in theoretical and empirical forms. The increase in research on the relationship of economic growth and environment and the existence of such vast literature have changed the attitudes where economists are worried more about global warming, cleaner environment and reduction in emissions rather than the ultimate exhaustion of fossil fuel reservoirs and other natural resources for the purpose of development (Brock and Taylor, 2005).

The literature on the relationship of economic growth and environment can be divided into three categories; the growth-environment nexus, the growth-energy nexus and, combining the first two, the growth-energy-environment nexus (Baek and Kim, 2011). The first group has focused mainly on testing the validity of Environmental Kuznet curve (EKC) hypothesis to study the relationship between economic growth and environment. EKC hypothesis asserts that the initial stage of economic growth will tend to increase the level of emission as the production rises. However, after attaining the certain threshold of income, the effect turns opposite and environmental conditions start improving (Grossman and Krueger, 1991). The second group looked income and energy consumption as the main contributors of CO₂ emission and analyzed the causal relationship among these variables. The third group combined the techniques of the first two to analyze the relationship among the variables (Baek and Kim, 2011; Kasman and Duman, 2015; Al-Mulali and Ozturk, 2015; Al-Mulali et al., 2015b, 2015c; Farhani and Ozturk, 2015).

Testing the EKC hypothesis has been the central idea of majority of studies conducted on the growth-environment nexus. The EKC has an inverted-U shape indicating that after reaching a threshold, the pollution will decrease eventually. This behavior of economic growth and environment is explained through scale, technique and composition effect (Grossman and Krueger, 1991). Economic growth normally takes off with industrialization and production at a large scale. Such large scale production brings greater pollution as the economy is normally poor at this stage and cannot afford to obtain modern environmental friendly technology. However, as the economy grows and the income increases, innovations in production techniques take place and environment friendly technology is adopted. This results in lowering the emission level. Finally, as the economy grows further, the focus shifts from pollution-intensive manufacturing sector to pollution-free service sector thus causing the downward part of EKC (Grossman and Krueger, 1991). However, the effects of economic growth on the shape of EKC are not obvious and automatic (Frankel and Rose, 2005), and the different conditions of economy regarding the stage of economic development, the extent of participation in international trade and the strictness level of environmental control regulations will induce different effects of economic growth on environment in different countries (Baek and Kim, 2011). Although the most probable explanation of the inverted U-shaped of EKC can be the technological advancement with higher income, however the biggest reason seems to be the fact that richer countries have more strict environmental laws due to the demand of their citizens for a cleaner environment (Grossman and Krueger, 1994).

Economic growth is very much dependent upon the use of energy. Thus higher economic growth calls for more energy consumption which increases the emission of greenhouse gases (Kim and Baek, 2011), unless renewable energy sources are used in production. Yildirim et al. (2014) examine the relationship between energy consumption per capita and real GDP per capita for Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore and Thailand using both panel data causality which is taking into account cross-sectional dependence and heterogeneity among the countries and time series causality tests for the period 1971–2009. The conservation hypothesis is supported for Indonesia, Malaysia and Philippines. Although a bidirectional relation is found in the case of Thailand, since there is no positive effect of energy consumption on GDP, the conservation hypothesis is supported. In the pattern of Singapore, the neutrality hypothesis is supported. In addition, the increase in investment and labor force lead to more energy consumption in Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand. Apergis and Ozturk (2015) tested the EKC hypothesis for 14 Asian countries spanning the period 1990–2011. They focused on how both income and policies in these countries affect the income–emissions (environment) relationship. The Generalized Method of Moments (GMM) methodology using panel data is employed in a multivariate framework to test the EKC hypothesis. The multivariate framework includes: CO₂ emissions, GDP per capita, population density, land, industry shares in GDP, and four indicators that measure the quality of institutions. In terms of the presence of an inverted U-shape association between emissions and income per capita, the estimates have the expected signs and are statistically significant, yielding empirical support to the presence of an EKC hypothesis. Uddin et al. (2016) investigate the long run Granger causality relationship between energy consumption, carbon emissions, economic growth and trade openness in Sri Lanka. The analysis reveals that, there exists long–run causal relationship between carbon emission and economic growth for Sri Lanka over the period of 1971–2006. In addition, there is unidirectional causality running from economic growth to the carbon emission and energy consumption.

Another variable that has gained importance among environmental economists in recent years is trade liberalization. Theoretically, international trade can have both positive as well as negative impacts on environment. On the one hand, it increases income which eventually leads to demand for better environment, while on the other hand, it can tempt developing countries to increase their production without taking care of environment and thus increasing GHG emissions (Forslid et al., 2014). Trade liberalization is being argued, in the developing literature, to accelerate economic growth which, according to EKC hypothesis, will eventually reduce environmental pollution. Trade liberalization impacts environment in a positive way by increasing national income and allowing the countries to specialize in the activities that best suit their conditions. Trade liberalization not only brings opportunity to produce in huge quantities (scale effect), but also carries modern technology (technique effect) and managerial philosophy (composition effect) across the borders. Thus, it helps developing countries to reduce their emissions by making available modern technology and environmental friendly techniques of production to them (Grossman and Krueger, 1991). Proponents of international trade argue that interactions with the international trade community encourage innovations and thus enabling countries to achieve sustainable growth. Furthermore, it allows consumers in developing countries to be exposed to a variety of products from all over the world, it can increase demand for environmental friendly products (Frankel and Rose, 2005). On the other side, firms that compete in international market i.e. exporters, tend to be cleaner than non-exporters mainly because of the international competitive pressures and because of high productivity which allows them to invest more in abatement technologies (Forslid et al., 2014). Having no competitive advantage, eventually the dirtier firms will be weeded out by cleaner firms in developing countries as a result of engaging in international trade (Forslid et al., 2014).

While there are many proponents of international trade, many others think it will only worsen the environment, especially in developing countries. The most recent arguments against trade openness in literature are the *race to bottom hypothesis* and the *pollution haven hypothesis*. Environmentalists argue that with open trade less developed countries will slacken their environmental regulation standards, which are not strict at all, in order to retain competitiveness against their advanced rivals (Frankel and Rose, 2005, Kozul-Wright and Fortunato, 2012). This is called the *race to bottom hypothesis*. The *Pollution Haven Hypothesis* argues that since developed countries have strict environmental regulations, the firms in developed countries are at disadvantage to produce pollution intensive products. They will, therefore, transfer their production of such goods to developing countries where the regulations are soft (Managi et al., 2008; Grossman and Krueger, 1994). Opponents of trade openness accuses international trade for being the source for developed countries to externalize the environmental burden by shifting the pollution intensive industries to poor countries and importing the products back from there (Wiebe et al., 2012). “Dirty” industries are, therefore, expected to flourish with trade liberalization especially in developing countries (Takeda and Matsuura, 2006). This strategy, although useful for decreasing pollution within the borders, however does no good for global emission level and does not help in combating global warming. Another issue is of “Carbon Leakage” where firms either relocate their production facilities from countries with stringent environmental regulations to countries having slack policies, or lose market share to those firms that relocate their facilities (Kozul-Wright and Fortunato, 2012). This fear of losing market share will enforce firms to transfer their facilities to less regulated countries and become an importer of pollution. The stage of economic development plays an important role in whether a country will be exporter or importer of pollution (Takeda and Matsuura, 2006). The results of Takeda and Matsuura(2006) show that Japan has been an exporter, importer and again exporter of dirty goods to/from Singapore and Hong Kong in different stages of economic development in these countries. This status of exporter and importer changed with other East Asian countries as well. Thus, although developed countries are able to reduce their GDP to energy consumption ratio reaching the flat part of EKC, this reduction is mainly due to imports of pollution intensive goods from developing countries (Suri and Chapman, 1998). In such situation, the traditional production-based emission accounting approach, where the emission level is allocated to the countries where it is produced, is not the right approach to study the impacts of international trade on environment. A consumption-based approach must be adopted where the emission level is calculated by the emissions required for producing the goods consumed in a country (Wiebe et al., 2012).

There is a plethora of empirical studies conducted on the relationship of economic growth and environment. However, despite the vast literature, based on existing literature on individual countries data, no conclusive relationship can be established between economic growth and CO₂ emission (Saboori et al., 2012). Although many studies have found the EKC hypothesis valid, many others did not find any sign of an inverted U-shaped for the EKC especially studies from developed and developing countries have produced different results. In their seminal study on the subject, (Grossman and Krueger, 1991) studied cross-section data for SO₂ and smoke from 42 countries and found that the pollutants decrease as the per capita GDP increases i.e. validity of EKC hypothesis. Kasman and Duman (2015) tested the EKC hypothesis using panel data from new EU members and candidate countries taking income, energy consumption, trade openness and urbanization as the potential contributors of carbon emissions. Their results, obtained from panel unit root tests and panel cointegration tests confirmed the validity of EKC. They further found short term unidirectional causality among the variables towards carbon emissions and long run bidirectional causality suggesting that carbon emissions will increase with higher economic output in the near future. (Jalil and

Mahmud, 2009) tested the EKC hypothesis using panel data from 1971-2005 for China using CO₂ emission as proxy for environmental degradation. They found EKC valid in case of China. They also found a unidirectional causality running from economic growth to CO₂ emission and energy consumption and from trade openness to CO₂ emission. (Saboori et al., 2012) studied long-run and causal relationship between economic growth and environment for Malaysia and found the significance of EKC. Their results found no short-run causality among the variables while in long-run, economic growth tends to increase CO₂ emission. Heidari et al. (2015) analyzed data from five ASEAN countries and found a nonlinear relationship among economic growth measured by per capita GDP, environmental degradation measured by CO₂ emission and energy consumption. Their analysis confirmed the validity of EKC for the five countries and found that beyond the threshold parameter (i.e. 4648 USD per capita income) the CO₂ emission starts to decline.

Whereas these studies found EKC to be valid, many others found different results. Suri and Chapman (1998), in a study from both developed and developing countries, found the turning point of the EKC to be \$55000 which is never achieved by any country yet. With the introduction of international trade in their model, the threshold point increased from \$55000 to \$224000 indicating that trade openness plays a positive role in increasing the emission level in all countries. Results of Managi et al. (2008) indicate that emissions of SO₂ and CO₂ increase as the production or income induced by trade openness increases in non-OECD (developing) countries while in OECD (developed) countries, the emissions decrease. However, emissions of BOD decrease in both OECD and non-OECD countries with increased income. One possible explanation for this can be that the social pressure against water pollution is stronger as compared to that against air pollution in developing countries. Also it is possible that because the cost of abatement technologies for BOD is less than those for SO₂ or CO₂, developing countries use these technologies more frequently (Managi et al., 2008). (Begum et al., 2015) found a U-shaped curve (opposite of that suggested by EKC) between economic growth and environment for Malaysia. Their results further found that population growth has no impact on CO₂ emission. Hossain (2011) using panel data from Newly Industrialized Countries found no long run relationship between CO₂ emission, economic growth, energy consumption, trade openness and urbanization. However, the study found that in short run, economic growth and trade openness have unidirectional relationship with CO₂ emission. The results indicate that for newly industrialized countries, the long run elasticity of CO₂ emission with respect to energy consumption is higher than short run indicating that pollution will continue to rise in long run for the NIC under study. Kozul-Wright and Fortunato (2012) studied data of CO₂ emission and GDP from 181 countries to study EKC hypothesis. Their data showed no sign of any turning down point thus invalidating the EKC hypothesis, and that the CO₂ emission behaved to increase with higher income. Their results show that per capita income tends to increase emission of CO₂ as well as cumulative measure of GHG emission.

Al-mulali et al. (2013) analyzed data from 14 Middle East and North African (MENA) countries from 1996-2012 using Pedroni Cointegration test and FMOLS. Their results show that energy consumption, trade openness, urbanization, and industrial developments cause environmental degradation while political stability has favorable impacts on environment.

Impacts of trade openness on environment have been empirically tested by many researchers. Takeda and Matsuura (2006) tested the impact of trade liberalization on CO₂ emissions by studying the trade pattern of dirty goods between ten East Asian countries and Japan and USA. Their results show that increase in exports of dirty goods to Japan increases domestic CO₂ emission in each country while imports of dirty goods from Japan has no impact on CO₂ emissions. For USA, they didn't find statistically significant impact of either

exports or imports of dirty goods for any of the countries under study. The overall results of Takeda and Matsuura (2006) support the *Pollution Haven Hypothesis* and indicate that trade liberalization increases CO₂ emission in East Asian countries. Wiebe et al. (2012) using consumption-based approach to emission found that the net imports of OECD (developed) countries increased by 80% between 1995 and 2005 while the net exports of BRICSA and non-OECD countries increased for the same period of time therefore supporting the Pollution Haven hypothesis that the developed countries have externalized the environmental burden through international trade. Naranpanawa (2011) investigated the relationship between trade openness and CO₂ emission in case of Sri Lanka and found that although the variables are related in the long run, there is no long run causality between trade openness and CO₂ emission. The results of Baek and Kim (2011) supported the gain from trade hypothesis for developed countries while for developing countries they found that the Race to Bottom Hypothesis holds where the developing countries seem to lower the level of environmental regulations in order to attract multi nationals and foreign investments. The empirical results of Frankel and Rose (2005) reject the race to bottom hypothesis and support the gains from trade hypothesis. Furthermore, the results did not find any support for the Pollution Haven hypothesis. Thus, according to Frankel and Rose (2005) trade openness neither shifts pollution to developing countries through the environmental competitive advantage hypothesis nor does it increase pollution in countries which specializes in capital intensive production.

With such different and controversial results of the studies conducted on the topic, it is evident that economic growth and increase in income are not automatic cure for environmental degradation, rather there is a need for devising policy strategies that will make the EKC more flat for, especially, developing countries and help to reduce emissions worldwide (Kozul-Wright and Fortunato, 2012). However, such policies can only be materialized if proper institutions are in place to transform popular demand for cleaner environment into regulations (Grossman and Krueger, 1991, Kozul-Wright and Fortunato, 2012). There is a need for international cooperation to resolve the global environmental problems (Frankel and Rose, 2005). Various efforts have been initiated on the international level e.g. the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Kyoto Protocol, the Bali roadmap etc. However, as most countries are guided by their national self-interest to participate in global emission reduction agreements, the hope for cooperative efforts to reduce global emission is very little (Carbone et al., 2009). It is because the benefits of emission reduction are worldwide while the costs normally pertain to the country that makes efforts for emission reductions, no individual country would voluntarily adopt emission abatement policies. Therefore, there is a need for multilateral efforts to address the issue (Kozul-Wright and Fortunato, 2012).

3. Methodology and Data

3.1. Methodology

3.1.1. Levine-Lin-Chu (L-L-C) Panel Unit Root Test

The test for unit root has become a standard practice in applied time series econometrics literature ((Chang, 2010); (Ozturk and Acaravci, 2013)). However, (Maddala, 1999) argue that the individual unit root tests have limited power to maintain the persistence of individual regression errors across the cross sections. Later, Levin et al. (2002) develops a panel unit root test by pooling the cross section that allows trend and intercept coefficients to freely move across the cross sections and generated pooled t-statistics. hence, Levin-Lin-Chu (llc) unit root test provides better approximation results as compare to common panel unit root tests ((Niu et al., 2011); (Akhmat et al., 2014). LLC test suggests the following hypothesis.

Null hypothesis (H_0): each time series contains a unit root.

Alternate hypothesis (H_1): each time series is stationary.

Here the lag order (p) allowed to vary across the cross-sections and the procedure functions in the following way;

In the first step, we run augmented Dickey- Fuller (ADF) for each cross-section on the equation:

$$\Delta Y_{i,t} = \rho y_{i,t-1} + \sum_{L=1}^{p_i} \theta_{iL} \Delta Y_{i,t-L} + \alpha_{i,t} d_{m,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (1)$$

The second step involves two auxiliary regressions:

- 1) $\Delta Y_{i,t}$ on $\Delta y_{i,t-L}$ & $d_{m,t}$ which obtain residual $\hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t}$ and,
- 2) $y_{i,t-1}$ on $\Delta y_{i,t-L}$ & $d_{m,t}$ which get residual $\hat{v}_{i,t-1}$.

In the third step, we standardize the residuals by performing;

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_{i,t} = \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,t} / \tilde{\sigma}_{\varepsilon_{i,t}} \quad (2)$$

$$\tilde{v}_{i,t-1} = \hat{v}_{i,t-1} / \tilde{\sigma}_{\varepsilon_{i,t}} \quad (3)$$

Where $\tilde{\sigma}_{\varepsilon_{i,t}}$ represents the standard-error in each ADF-test

Finally, the pooled OLS regression is performed by:

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_{i,t} = \rho \tilde{v}_{i,t-1} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (4)$$

The null hypothesis is $\rho = 1$. However, the Levin-Lin-Chu test requires to adjust the t -statistics under the condition $\sqrt{N_T} / T \rightarrow 0$. Levin et al. (2002) suggest that the sufficient conditions are explained by $\sqrt{N_T} / T \rightarrow 0$ and $N_T / T \rightarrow k$, where the cross-sectional dimension (N) is a monotonic function of time dimension (T). The literature opines that the test is useful for macro panels if statistics fall between 10-250 and 5-250 in case of ‘ N ’ and ‘ T ’, respectively. The small value of T reflects that the panel is undersized and as a result bears low power. Whereas, the large T value insists to check the unit root for each cross-section individually. The test is considered restrictive in the sense that it’s null-hypothesis accounts unit root for all cross-sections that ignores the notion that some cross-sections are subject to a unit root and some are not. Another disadvantage associated with this test statistic is that it assumes the panel is cross-sectional independent. Therefore, in order to avoid the disadvantages of Levin-Lin-Chu unit root test, we also apply Breitung panel unit root test developed in (Breitung, 2002). Breitung test qualifies for non-stationary panels as well (Moon et al., 2006)

3.1.2. Panel Cointegration Tests

The time series econometrics literature suggests that the development of cointegration to panel data is also recent. Therefore, following the panel unit root tests, we incorporate panel cointegration tests to investigate the long-run association among the variables. However, the techniques available so far are divided in to two main groups; one that uses null hypothesis as “no-cointegration” (i.e. (Pedroni, 1999); (Kao, 1999); (Larsson et al., 2001); (Groen and Kleibergen, 2003) and other takes “cointegration” as null hypothesis (i.e. (McCoskey and Kao, 1998); (Maddala, 1999); (Westerlund, 2007)). For present analysis, we utilize three different panel cointegration techniques representing both approaches, proposed by (Pedroni, 1999, Pedroni, 2004), (Kao, 1999) and (Maddala and Kim, 1998). Pedroni (1999, 2004) proposes seven different statistics to test for cointegration relationship in heterogeneous panel. These tests are corrected for bias introduced by potentially endogenous regressors. The

seven test statistics of Pedroni are classified into within dimension and between dimensions statistics. Within dimension statistics are referred to as panel cointegration statistics, while between dimension statistics are called group mean panel cointegration statistics. These cointegration test statistics are based on the extension of two step residual based strategy of Engle and Granger (1987). In the first step, procedure involves estimation of seven test statistics essential and stores the residuals. The model is run on the following test equation:

$$x_{i,t} = \alpha_{0i} + \rho_i t + \beta_{1i} Z_{1i,t} + \dots + \beta_{mi} Z_{mi,t} + \mu_{it} \quad (5)$$

In the second step, the first difference of each cross-section in the panel from original data series is taken in order to calculate the residual of differenced regression:

$$\Delta x_{i,t} = \theta_{1i} \Delta Z_{1i,t} + \dots + \theta_{mi} \Delta Z_{mi,t} + \eta_{it} \quad (6)$$

In the third step, estimate the long-run variance ($\hat{\kappa}_{11,i}^2$) from the residuals ($\hat{\eta}_{it}$) of the differenced regression. In the fourth step, using the residual ($\hat{\mu}_{it}$) of original co integrating equation, estimate the appropriate autoregressive model. Following these steps, the seven panel test statistics are computed with appropriate mean and variance adjustment terms as described by (Pedroni, 1999).

Panel v-Statistic:

$$Z_v \equiv T^2 N^{3/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\kappa}_{11,i}^{-2} \hat{\mu}_{it-1}^2 \right)^{-1} \quad (7)$$

Panel ρ -statistic:

$$Z_\rho \equiv T \sqrt{N} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\kappa}_{11,i}^{-2} \hat{\mu}_{it-1}^2 \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\kappa}_{11,i}^{-2} (\hat{\mu}_{it-1} \Delta \hat{\mu}_{it} - \hat{\lambda}_i) \quad (8)$$

Panel t-statistic (non-parametric):

$$Z_t \equiv \left(\hat{\sigma}^2 \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\kappa}_{11,i}^{-2} \hat{\mu}_{it-1}^2 \right)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\kappa}_{11,i}^{-2} (\hat{\mu}_{it-1} \Delta \hat{\mu}_{it} - \hat{\lambda}_i) \quad (9)$$

Panel t-statistic (parametric):

$$Z_t^* \equiv \left(\hat{s}_{N,T}^{*2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\kappa}_{11,i}^{-2} \hat{\mu}_{it-1}^2 \right)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\kappa}_{11,i}^{-2} \hat{\mu}_{it-1}^* \Delta \hat{\mu}_{it}^* \quad (10)$$

Group ρ -statistic:

$$\tilde{Z}_\rho \equiv TN^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\mu}_{it-1}^2 \right)^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T (\hat{\mu}_{it-1} \Delta \hat{\mu}_{it} - \hat{\lambda}_i) \quad (11)$$

Group t-statistic (non-parametric):

$$\tilde{Z}_t \equiv N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\hat{\sigma}_i^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\mu}_{it-1}^2 \right)^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T (\hat{\mu}_{it-1} \Delta \hat{\mu}_{it} - \hat{\lambda}_i) \quad (12)$$

Group t-statistic (parametric):

$$\tilde{Z}_t^* \equiv N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{s}_i^{*2} \hat{\mu}_{it-1}^{*2} \right)^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\mu}_{it-1}^* \Delta \hat{\mu}_{it}^* \quad (13)$$

$$\text{Where } \hat{\lambda}_i = \frac{1}{2} (\hat{\sigma}_i^2 - \hat{s}_i^2) \text{ and } \tilde{s}_{N,T}^{*2} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{s}_i^{*2} \quad (14)$$

Having calculating the panel cointegration test statistics, necessary adjustment terms for mean and variance are assigned in order to ensure the asymptotic distribution of test statistics.

$$\frac{X_{N,T} - \mu\sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{V}} \Rightarrow N(0,1) \quad (15)$$

Here, $X_{N,T}$ denotes the test statistics of N and T in a standardized form. u and v are the movement functions of Brownian motion. The null hypothesis of no cointegration for all test statistics is given by:

$$H_0 : \rho_i = 1 \quad \text{for all } i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (16)$$

and, alternative hypothesis for between the dimension and within dimension for panel co integration is given by:

$$H_0 : \rho_i < 1 \quad \text{for all } i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (17)$$

Similarly, the alternative hypothesis for within dimension statistics is given by:

$$H_0 : \rho_i = \rho < 1 \quad \text{for all } i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (18)$$

Assume a common value for $\rho_i = \rho$. Under the alternative hypothesis, all the panel test statistics diverge to negative infinity. Thus, the left tail of the standard normal distribution is required to reject the null hypothesis.

3.1.3. Panel Cointegration Estimates

Subsequent of applying cointegration test and confirming that there exists a long run association among underlying variables, the next step is to estimate the associated long-run cointegration parameters. Fixed effect, random effect and GMM method could lead to inconsistent and misleading coefficients when applied to cointegrated panel data. For this reason, we estimate the long-run models using “group mean” fully modified OLS (FMOLS) methods. Following (Pedroni, 2001), FMOLS technique generates consistent estimates in small samples and does not suffer from large size distortions in the presence of endogeneity and heterogeneous dynamics. The panel FMOLS estimator for the coefficient β is defined as:

$$\hat{\beta} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\sum_{t=1}^T (y_{it} - \bar{y})^2 \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T (y_{it} - \bar{y}) \right) z_{it}^* - T \hat{\eta}_i \quad (19)$$

Where $z_{it}^* = (z_{it} - \bar{z}) - \frac{\hat{L}_{21i}}{\hat{L}_{22i}} \Delta y_{it}$, $\hat{\eta}_i \equiv \hat{\Gamma}_{21i} + \hat{\Omega}_{21i}^0 - \frac{\hat{L}_{21i}}{\hat{L}_{22i}} (\hat{\Gamma}_{22i} + \hat{\Omega}_{22i}^0)$ and \hat{L}_i is a lower triangular decomposition of $\hat{\Omega}_i$. The associated t-statistics gives:

$$t_{\hat{\beta}^*} = N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N t_{\hat{\beta}^*,i} \quad \text{Where } t_{\hat{\beta}^*,i} = \left(\hat{\beta}_i^* - \beta_0 \right) \left[\hat{\Omega}_{11i}^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T (y_{it} - \bar{y})^2 \right]^{1/2} \quad (20)$$

3.1.4. Decomposition Analysis

In the recent applied economics literature, Granger causality analysis is commonly used method to test the causal links among the variables. However, Granger causality along with other causality test (i.e. Toda-Yamamoto) do not give relative strength of causal links (Shahbaz, 2012). Alternatively, impulse response function (IRF) and forecast error variance decomposition method (FEVDM) provide an Innovative Accounting Approach (IAA) for testing causal links among the variables. The IAA provides prominent method of explaining the estimated linear and non-linear multivariate time series models (Ahmed et al., 2016d; Alves and Moutinho, 2013; Lanne and Nyberg, 2014; Shahbaz, 2015). We preferred this approach over traditionally used Granger causality tests because IAA does not only provide the direction of causality but also the magnitude of causal links among the variables at different time periods ((Menyah and Wolde-Rufael, 2010); (Hassan et al., 2011); (Shahbaz, 2012); (Tiwari and Shahbaz, 2014)). Furthermore, under FEVDM process, the variance in

each vector is decomposed in exogenous (change occurs due to other variables in the model) and endogenous (change occurs due its own innovative shocks) during vector autoregression (VAR) and IRF characterize the reaction of endogenous variable; whereas, the Granger causality has limitation of calculating only exogenous change. However, the concept of exogeneity in IAA is different from Granger causality in a way that in IAA it refers to the contemporaneous value of an endogenous variable and the contemporaneous error term of another variable (Cloyne, 2013).

3.2. Data

This study uses the following log-linear model to investigate the relationship between CO₂ emission, energy consumption, economic growth, trade openness and population growth:

$$\ln CO_{2it} = \beta_1 + \beta_{EN} \ln EN_{it} + \beta_{GDP} \ln GDP_{it} + \beta_{TR} \ln TR_{it} + \beta_Y \ln POP_{it} + \mu_t \quad (21)$$

We use per capita CO₂ emission, energy consumption (oil use), GDP (current US\$), trade (exports+imports) and population growth as the proxy of $\ln CO_{2it}$, $\ln EN_{it}$, $\ln GDP_{it}$, $\ln TR_{it}$ and $\ln POP_{it}$, respectively. The annual data over the period of 1971-2013 taken from World Bank's World Development Indicators (CD-ROM, 2014) for the panel of selected South Asian countries.

4. Results and Discussion

As discussed in previous section, applied time series econometrics necessitates the stationary data before testing the long-run association between the variables based on cointegration. Therefore, the empirical analysis of this paper begins with the application of (Levin et al., 2002) and (Breitung, 2002) approach to panel unit root test in order to check the stationarity of underlying time series. Unit root test also help us to avoid the problem of spurious or nonsense regression in the time series analysis. Table 1 displays the results of unit root analysis and indicate that we could reject the null hypothesis at level, but after considering the higher order (i.e. 1st difference) all the variables are stationary at 1% level of significance except $\ln POP_{it}$ which is significant at 10% level. Hence, unit root tests characterize each underlying series integrated at order $I(1)$. This notion allows us to proceed further for cointegration to test the long-run equilibrium relationship among the variables.

Table 1: Panel Unit Root Tests

Variables	At level				At 1 st Difference			
	Constant	P-value	Constant & Trend	P-value**	Constant	P-value	Constant & Trend	P-value**
Levin, Lin & Chu (LLC) - Panel Unit Root Test								
$\ln CO_{2it}$	-0.18347	0.4272	-2.83394	0.0023	-15.1955	0.0000	-13.0322	0.0000
$\ln EN_{it}$	4.84823	1.0000	1.87433	0.9696	-11.8925	0.0000	-12.7544	0.0000
$\ln GDP_{it}$	1.19610	0.8842	0.57264	0.7166	-6.57301	0.0000	-11.7617	0.0000
$\ln TR_{it}$	-0.69070	0.2449	-1.15319	0.1244	-15.1754	0.0000	-13.3729	0.0000
$\ln POP_{it}$	-3.00871	0.0013	-2.83394	0.0023	-1.77421	0.0380	3.63631	0.0999*
Breitung - Panel Unit Root Test								
$\ln CO_{2it}$	-	-	-2.38214	0.0086	-	-	-3.61742	0.0001
$\ln EN_{it}$	-	-	-8.06662	0.0000	-	-	-10.4771	0.0000
$\ln GDP_{it}$	-	-	-1.57511	0.0576	-	-	-7.43008	0.0000

$\ln TR_{it}$	-	-	-0.97879	0.1638	-	-	-6.48125	0.0000
$\ln POP_{it}$	-	-	6.88706	0.9000	-	-	2.99647	0.0986*
Note: * shows significant at 10% level. ** Probabilities are computed assuming asymptotic normality.								

As noticed in the literature review part, some studies report contrasting results due to difference in the technique used for cointegration analysis. Therefore, this study utilizes three different and commonly used cointegration methods to test the long-run association between CO₂ emissions, energy consumption, economic growth, trade openness and population density in case of five south Asian countries. (Pedroni, 1999, Pedroni, 2004) approach to panel cointegration is a residual based approach with seven different test statistics computed within dimensions (pooled) and between dimensions (collective mean) allowing individual heterogeneous fixed effect and trend terms. Hence, it provides comprehensive tool for analyzing the cointegration property of time series variables. However, Johansen-Fisher cointegration test solves the problem of heterogeneity by incorporating a Fisher's effect that aggregates *p*-value of Johansen test statistics (see (Maddala and Kim, 1998)). (Kao, 1999) argues that asymptotic distribution of least-square dummy variable (LSDV) has deep implications for residual based panel cointegration test. Therefore, he develops residual based cointegration test using augmented Dickey Fuller test to test the null hypothesis. In summary, all the panel cointegration tests applied in this study have individual unique property of checking the long-run relationship among the underlying vectors. It also distinguishes this study in term of methodology used in the past.

The results of cointegration tests are reported in Table 2. Pedroni panel cointegration test confirms the existence of cointegration among the variables. It implies that there is a long-run equilibrium relationship between CO₂ emissions, energy consumption, economic growth, trade openness and population growth in case of five selected countries of South Asia. Pedroni cointegration test results are validated by Johansen-Fisher cointegration and Kao residual based test results also. Our findings are consistent with Hossain (2011) who uses Johansen-Fisher cointegration test for the panel of newly industrializing countries. The overall cointegration test results serve the basic purpose of this study and permit us to further carry on to investigate the long-run elasticity between CO₂ emissions and four controlling variables i.e. energy consumption, economic growth, trade openness and population growth.

Table 2: Cointegration Tests

(A) Pedroni Panel Cointegration Test Results				
Alternative hypothesis: common AR coefs. (within-dimension)				
Tests	Statistics	P-value	Weighted Statistics	P-value
Panel v-Statistic	1.656867	0.0488	0.822052	0.2055
Panel rho-Statistic	-1.480148	0.0694	-1.363888	0.0863
Panel PP-Statistic	-3.641114	0.0001	-4.138672	0.0000
Panel ADF-Statistic	-3.819671	0.0001	-4.189413	0.0000
Alternative hypothesis: individual AR coefs. (between-dimension)				
Tests	Statistics	P-value		
Group rho-Statistic	-0.688550	0.2456		
Group PP-Statistic	-4.470020	0.0000		
Group ADF-Statistic	-3.970477	0.0000		
(B) Johansen Fisher Panel Cointegration Test				

Unrestricted Cointegration Rank Test (Trace and Maximum Eigenvalue)				
Tests	Fisher Stat. (from trace test)	P-value*	Fisher Stat.* (from max-eigen test)	P-value*
None	165.7	0.0000	92.92	0.0000
At most 1	95.53	0.0000	52.69	0.0000
At most 2	56.86	0.0000	27.76	0.0020
At most 3	36.71	0.0001	25.62	0.0043
At most 4	23.13	0.0103	23.13	0.0103
(C) Kao Residual Cointegration Test				
None			t-Statistic	Prob.
Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF)			-5.008807	0.0000

* Probabilities are computed using asymptotic Chi-square distribution

The cointegration tests confirm the long-run association among the underlying vectors. However, it is essential to determine the long-run elasticities of dependant and independent variables. For this purpose, this study uses fully modified OLS (FMOLS) estimation technique developed by Pedroni (2001) which gives consistent and unbiased long-run coefficients in the model. We analyze both grouped and as well country specific estimations to turn our study more robust in term of policy standpoint. The results of FMOLS group- and country specific test results are represented by Table 3A and Table 3B, respectively. The grouped long-run estimates indicate that the energy consumption, trade openness and population growth have positive and statistically significant effect on CO₂ emissions. However, economic growth has small but negative impact on carbon emissions. More specifically, 1% increase in energy consumption, trade openness and population growth increase CO₂ emissions level by 1.01%, 0.09% and 0.6%, respectively. In terms of economic growth, 1% increase in GDP decreases CO₂ emissions by 0.06%. In South Asian region, energy consumption and population growth are major contributors to regional environmental degradation.

Table 3A: FMOLS Grouped Results

ln C_{it} : Dependent Variable				
Country/Variables	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
ln EN_{it}	1.009067	0.089298	11.30003	0.0000
ln GDP_{it}	-0.065389	0.021558	-3.033123	0.0027*
ln TR_{it}	0.095101	0.031295	3.038897	0.0027*
ln POP_{it}	0.683343	0.173557	3.937278	0.0001*
Note: * shows significant at 1% level.				

Furthermore, the country specific FMOLS results indicate that in India energy consumption and population growth have positive and statistically significant effects on CO₂ emissions, where 1% increase in energy consumption and population increases CO₂ emission by 0.93% and 1.42%, respectively. However, economic growth has negative but statistical insignificant effect and trade openness has very small positive impact on CO₂ emissions. It is concluded that population growth and energy use are the first and second highest indicators of environmental degradation in India. These results are consistent with group FMOLS test

results. In case of Pakistan, energy consumption, economic growth and population growth have positive and statistically significant impact on CO₂ emissions, where 1% increase in energy consumption, economic growth and population increase CO₂ emission by 1.79%, 0.27%, and 0.22%, respectively. Whereas, trade openness reduces CO₂ emissions by 0.27%. Hence, energy consumption is the largest contributing factor towards the environmental degradation in Pakistan. These results are consistent with the estimation results of Ahmed and Long (2013). In Bangladesh, energy consumption, economic growth and population growth have positive and statistically significant impact on CO₂ emissions, where 1% increase in energy consumption, economic growth and population increase CO₂ emission by 0.87%, 0.07%, and 1.31%, respectively. Whereas, trade openness has small but negative impact on CO₂ emissions. Population growth is the highest contributing factor towards CO₂ emission in Bangladesh. For Srilanka, energy consumption and trade openness have positive and statistically significant impact on CO₂ emissions, where 1% increase in energy consumption and trade openness increase CO₂ emissions by 2.56% and 0.48%, respectively. Whereas, economic growth and population growth has negative effect on CO₂ emissions. Energy use in Srilanka is the highest contributing factor towards CO₂ emissions. In Nepal, trade openness and population growth have negative and statistically significant effect on CO₂ emissions. Whereas energy consumption and economic growth have negative effect on CO₂ emissions. Population growth serves highest CO₂ emissions in Nepal. The FMOLS country specific results are consistent with FMOLS-grouped long-run elasticities. Population and energy consumption are the major factors contribute to CO₂ emissions in South Asian region.

Table 3B: FMOLS Country Specific Results

ln C _{it} : Dependent Variable				
Country/Variables	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
India				
ln EN _{it}	0.931443	0.122592	7.597904	0.0000
ln GDP _{it}	-0.004398	0.039677	-0.110842	0.9123
ln TR _{it}	-0.058504	0.033774	-1.732237	0.0916***
ln POP _{it}	1.429013	0.084354	16.94077	0.0000
Constant	-33.64376	1.369472	-24.56697	0.0000
Pakistan				
ln EN _{it}	1.793608	0.182149	9.846944	0.0000
ln GDP _{it}	0.273024	0.026182	10.42806	0.0000
ln TR _{it}	-0.273405	0.033429	-8.178584	0.0000
ln POP _{it}	0.227079	0.134413	1.689405	0.0996***
Constant	-16.00431	1.225291	-13.06164	0.0000
Bangladesh				
ln EN _{it}	0.875865	0.079768	10.98010	0.0000
ln GDP _{it}	0.077823	0.019073	4.080186	0.0002*
ln TR _{it}	-0.035302	0.023676	-1.491079	0.0144**
ln POP _{it}	1.319072	0.069993	18.84580	0.0000
Constant	-31.64837	1.015230	-31.17360	0.0000

Sri Lanka				
$\ln EN_{it}$	2.565174	0.303241	8.459204	0.0000
$\ln GDP_{it}$	-0.217881	0.091923	-2.370246	0.0231**
$\ln TR_{it}$	0.483722	0.147790	3.273037	0.0023**
$\ln POP_{it}$	-2.305114	0.859879	-2.680743	0.0109**
Constant	16.76918	11.76277	1.425615	0.1624
Nepal				
$\ln EN_{it}$	-1.120755	0.282430	-3.968251	0.0003*
$\ln GDP_{it}$	-0.455513	0.045997	-9.903015	0.0000
$\ln TR_{it}$	0.358995	0.055963	6.414843	0.0000
$\ln POP_{it}$	2.746666	0.292136	9.401998	0.0000
Constant	-38.06728	3.269327	-11.64377	0.0000
Note: (*), (**), (***) shows significant at 1%, 5% and 10% level, respectively.				

Having confirmed the long-run association and generating the individual estimates, we now utilize the set of forecast error variance decomposition method (FEVDM) and impulse response function (IRF) in their generalized forms, called Innovative Accounting Approach (IAA) for causality analysis. IAA is a distinct approach to interpret the estimated linear and non-linear multivariate time series models. Moreover, it has a superiority over commonly practiced Granger causality approach does not capture the relative strength of causal links amidst variables beyond the selected time periods (Shahbaz, 2012). The model is simulated in a vector auto-regression (VAR) setting that examines the causal link between the CO₂ emission, energy consumption, economic growth, population and trade openness and, the results are reported in Table 4. The calculations are shown in 14 different time horizons over the period 1971-2013. Each section in the table itemizes the account change in an endogenous variable due its own innovative shock and rest of the exogenous variables. For example; the decomposition analysis of $\ln CO_{2it}$ between 1971-2013 reveals that 82.3% change in CO₂ emissions is endogenously contributed due its own innovative shocks and 11.5%, 2.9%, 2.8% and 0.3% is contributed by trade openness, economic growth and population growth and energy consumption, respectively. It implies that in the panel countries, carbon emission is mostly contributed by trade openness, economic growth and increasing population density. Similarly, in case of energy consumption, which is 88% is self-contributed and, 7.8, 3.4% and 0.6% is contributed by trade openness, CO₂ emissions, population density and economic growth, respectively. Whereas; economic growth, trade openness and population growth is mostly contributed by CO₂ emission (4.8%), economic growth (1.6%) and trade openness (9.6%) and self-contributed by 91.9%, 96.9%, 85.5, respectively.

Table 4. Variance Decomposition Analysis

Variance Decomposition of $\ln CO_{2it}$:						
Period	S.E	$\ln CO_{2it}$	$\ln EN_{it}$	$\ln GDP_{it}$	$\ln TR_{it}$	$\ln POP_{it}$
1	0.100623	100.0000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000
2	0.133620	98.17476	0.117636	0.771020	0.650833	0.285752
3	0.156304	96.48307	0.120245	1.154198	1.498756	0.743730
4	0.173811	94.66206	0.132156	1.441679	2.547452	1.216655
5	0.188106	92.73612	0.149618	1.699665	3.771082	1.643515

6	0.200219	90.73254	0.172846	1.947157	5.142722	2.004739
7	0.210782	88.67396	0.201258	2.191128	6.634339	2.299318
8	0.220206	86.57844	0.234060	2.434258	8.219413	2.533830
9	0.228778	84.46221	0.270289	2.677357	9.872968	2.717178
10	0.236700	82.34047	0.308922	2.920396	11.57195	2.858266
Variance Decomposition of $\ln EN_{it}$:						
Period	S.E.	$\ln CO_{2it}$	$\ln EN_{it}$	$\ln GDP_{it}$	$\ln TR_{it}$	$\ln POP_{it}$
1	0.022241	7.629404	92.37060	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000
2	0.030043	7.686605	91.88043	0.060668	0.266028	0.106271
3	0.036099	6.997303	91.91376	0.066455	0.765871	0.256608
4	0.041204	6.313531	91.80621	0.058156	1.430881	0.391222
5	0.045732	5.681402	91.53386	0.048530	2.243475	0.492734
6	0.049865	5.115364	91.10297	0.040819	3.180145	0.560700
7	0.053712	4.614629	90.52747	0.035983	4.221488	0.600431
8	0.057344	4.174180	89.82285	0.034170	5.350380	0.618425
9	0.060810	3.787742	89.00465	0.035203	6.551822	0.620586
10	0.064144	3.448981	88.08796	0.038764	7.812589	0.611711
Variance Decomposition of $\ln GDP_{it}$:						
Period	S.E.	$\ln CO_{2it}$	$\ln EN_{it}$	$\ln GDP_{it}$	$\ln TR_{it}$	$\ln POP_{it}$
1	0.116153	2.687494	0.040978	97.27153	0.000000	0.000000
2	0.165619	1.881076	0.225186	97.51858	0.191352	0.183803
3	0.201981	1.909664	0.373262	97.15066	0.147643	0.418767
4	0.232060	2.167410	0.500267	96.56047	0.111953	0.659899
5	0.258170	2.530149	0.619997	95.86332	0.098795	0.887742
6	0.281455	2.949561	0.733869	95.11021	0.111195	1.095161
7	0.302594	3.400544	0.842726	94.32811	0.148088	1.280527
8	0.322021	3.867117	0.947016	93.53421	0.206914	1.444741
9	0.340037	4.338362	1.047093	92.74011	0.284770	1.589665
10	0.356856	4.806525	1.143249	91.95402	0.378800	1.717406
Variance Decomposition of $\ln TR_{it}$:						
Period	S.E.	$\ln CO_{2it}$	$\ln EN_{it}$	$\ln GDP_{it}$	$\ln TR_{it}$	$\ln POP_{it}$
1	0.134024	0.844303	0.302211	3.011936	95.84155	0.000000
2	0.173680	1.329319	0.342804	2.781971	95.53033	0.015577
3	0.208041	1.380341	0.366736	2.507035	95.71976	0.026127
4	0.237001	1.391752	0.376193	2.284128	95.91339	0.034538
5	0.262725	1.380122	0.380888	2.085560	96.11341	0.040018
6	0.286003	1.362285	0.381680	1.907432	96.30563	0.042977
7	0.307386	1.343616	0.379751	1.746687	96.48604	0.043904
8	0.327225	1.326853	0.375759	1.601540	96.65253	0.043317
9	0.345775	1.313259	0.370188	1.470712	96.80416	0.041680
10	0.363220	1.303434	0.363394	1.353239	96.94054	0.039392
Variance Decomposition of $\ln POP_{it}$:						
Period	S.E.	$\ln CO_{2it}$	$\ln EN_{it}$	$\ln GDP_{it}$	$\ln TR_{it}$	$\ln POP_{it}$
1	0.004107	0.128268	0.940347	0.134107	0.153531	98.64375
2	0.007994	0.306573	0.429004	0.037345	0.775121	98.45196
3	0.011881	0.473624	0.603683	0.061165	1.456020	97.40551

4	0.015654	0.687144	0.815403	0.131874	2.298001	96.06758
5	0.019284	0.936205	0.988517	0.233528	3.281867	94.55988
6	0.022782	1.210455	1.122308	0.358790	4.391314	92.91713
7	0.026170	1.499857	1.224221	0.502545	5.606012	91.16737
8	0.029469	1.795552	1.301342	0.660482	6.905326	89.33730
9	0.032703	2.090107	1.359185	0.828772	8.269552	87.45238
10	0.035890	2.377584	1.401894	1.004010	9.680793	85.53572
Chowlesky Ordering: $\ln CO_{2it}$ $\ln EN_{it}$ $\ln GDP_{it}$ $\ln TR_{it}$ $\ln POP_{it}$						

The overall FEVDM test results suggest that there is a feedback effect between CO₂ emissions and energy consumption and trade openness and energy consumption. Trade openness leads to energy consumption and energy consumption results in increase to CO₂ emissions. Furthermore, FEVDM results of $\ln CO_{2it}$, $\ln EN_{it}$, $\ln GDP_{it}$, $\ln TR_{it}$ and $\ln POP_{it}$ are checked using impulse response function (IRF) and graphically illustrated by figure-2. The binary relationship between five underlying variables is characterized as exogenous response between the variables. The each figure is showing the response function of numerical FEVDM test results in the form of graph. The variance decomposition analysis results are consistent with long-run estimates, validates overall econometric modeling and ensures findings robust and appropriate for policy use.




Figure 2: Impulse Response Function

5. Conclusion and Policy Implications

The aim of this paper is to examine the effect of energy consumption, income, trade openness and population on the CO₂ emission for selected five South Asia countries (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and Nepal) by using annual data from 1971 to 2013. After confirming that all the series are stationary using unit root test process, the study incorporates three different and advance panel cointegration tests. All the panel cointegration tests confirm that all the underlying variables are cointegrated. The long-run association between the variables is checked using FMOLS-grouped and individual cross-section country in the panel. The FMOLS grouped results show that the energy consumption, trade openness and population growth increase environmental degradation in the panel countries with exception of GDP which has negative impact on emissions. The innovative accounting approach (IAA) using variance decomposition test and impulse response function is applied to examine the causality amongst the vectors. The results show that there is bidirectional causality between energy consumption and trade openness and uni-directional causality running from energy consumption, trade openness and population to CO₂ emissions. The results enumerate that the energy consumption and population density increase CO₂ emissions in the long-run and foresee further environmental degradation in the region.

In regards to policy implications, there is a need for cooperation on the international level to resolve the global environmental problems. However, as also mentioned by Carbone et al. (2009) that most of the countries are guided by their national self-interest to participate in global emission reduction agreements. Our empirical findings suggest that India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka need to revisit the sustainable development policies. The energy consumption is highly emission intensive in these countries which potentially hinders their sustainable development goals. Furthermore, the current energy policy is unfriendly to sustainable development of the region. The population growth is the second largest factor contributing to CO₂ emissions in three largest economies- India, Pakistan and Bangladesh, which requires immediate policy response at national.

In comparison to other regional blocs, the South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation (SAARC) has been under utilized to address the common regional challenges. However, SAARC could be an appropriate platform in achieving sustainable development goal at regional level. The best example of such cooperation is available neighborly available in shape of ASEAN. The region can benefit from global efforts to solve environmental and energy security problems through global cooperation.

References

- Akhmat, G., Zaman, K., Shukui, T., Irfan, D., Khan, M.M. 2014. Does energy consumption contribute to environmental pollutants? Evidence from SAARC countries. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 21, 5940-5951.
- Al-Mulali, U., Ozturk, I. (2015). The Effect of Energy Consumption, Urbanization, Trade Openness, Industrial Output, and the Political Stability on the Environmental Degradation in the MENA Region, *Energy*. 84, 382-389.
- Al-Mulali, U., Tang, C.F., Ozturk, I. (2015a) Estimating The Environment Kuznets Curve Hypothesis: Evidence From Latin America and The Caribbean Countries. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Review*, 50, 918-924.
- Al-Mulali, U., Tang, C.F., Ozturk, I. (2015b). Does Financial Development Reduce Environmental Degradation? Evidence From A Panel Study of 129 Countries. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, forthcoming.

- <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11356-015-4726-x>
- Al-Mulali, U., Ozturk, I., Lean, H.H. (2015c). The influence of economic growth, urbanization, trade openness, financial development, and renewable energy on pollution in Europe. *Natural Hazards*, forthcoming. <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11069-015-1865-9>
- Apergis, N., Ozturk, I. (2015) Testing environmental Kuznets Hypothesis in Asian Countries. *Ecological Indicators*, 52, 16-22.
- Al-Mulali, U., Fereidouni, H.G., Lee, J.Y., Sab, C.N.B.C. 2013. Exploring the relationship between urbanization, energy consumption, and CO₂ emission in MENA countries. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 23, 107-112.
- Alves, M.R., Moutinho, V. 2013. Decomposition analysis and innovative accounting approach for energy-related CO₂ (carbon dioxide) emissions intensity over 1996–2009 in Portugal. *Energy*, 57, 775-787.
- Apergis, N., Ozturk, I. 2015. Testing environmental Kuznets Hypothesis in Asian Countries. *Ecological Indicators*, 52, 16-22.
- Baek, J., Kim, H.S. 2011. Trade liberalization, economic growth, energy consumption and the environment: Time series evidence from G-20 economies. *Journal of East Asian Economic Integration*, 15(1), 3-32.
- Bank, W. 2013. Turn down the heat: climate extremes, regional impacts, and the case for resilience. *World Bank*.
- Begum, R.A., Sohag, K., Abdullah, S.M.S., Jaafar, M. 2015. CO₂ emissions, energy consumption, economic and population growth in Malaysia. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 41, 594-601.
- Breitung, J. 2002. Nonparametric tests for unit roots and cointegration. *Journal of Econometrics*, 108, 343-363.
- Brock, W.A. Taylor, M.S. 2005. Economic growth and the environment: a review of theory and empirics. *Handbook of Economic Growth*, 1, 1749-1821.
- Carbone, J.C., Helm, C., Rutherford, T.F. 2009. The case for international emission trade in the absence of cooperative climate policy. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 58, 266-280.
- Chang, C.C. 2010. A multivariate causality test of carbon dioxide emissions, energy consumption and economic growth in China. *Applied Energy*, 87, 3533-3537.
- Cloyne, J. 2013. Discretionary tax changes and the macroeconomy: new narrative evidence from the United Kingdom. *The American Economic Review*, 103, 1507-1528.
- Farhani, S., Ozturk, I. 2015. Causal relationship between CO₂ emissions, real GDP, energy consumption, financial development, trade openness and urbanization in Tunisia. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*. <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11356-015-4767-1>
- Forslid, R., Okubo, T. Ulltveit-Moe, K.H. 2014. Why are firms that export cleaner? International trade and CO₂ emissions. CESifo Working Paper Series No. 4817.
- Frankel, J.A., Rose, A.K. 2005. Is trade good or bad for the environment? Sorting out the causality. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 87, 85-91.
- Groen, J.J.J., Kleibergen, F. 2003. Likelihood-based cointegration analysis in panels of vector error-correction models. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 21, 295-318.
- Grossman, G.M., Krueger, A.B. 1991. Environmental impacts of a North American free trade agreement. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Grossman, G.M., Krueger, A.B. 1994. Economic growth and the environment. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Hassan, M.N.A., Jaramillo, P., Griffin, W.M. 2011. Life cycle GHG emissions from Malaysian oil palm bioenergy development: The impact on transportation sector's

- energy security. *Energy Policy*, 39, 2615-2625.
- Heidari, H., Katircioglu, S.T., Saeidpour, L. 2015. Economic growth, CO 2 emissions, and energy consumption in the five ASEAN countries. *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, 64, 785-791.
- Hossain, M. S. 2011. Panel estimation for CO2 emissions, energy consumption, economic growth, trade openness and urbanization of newly industrialized countries. *Energy Policy*, 39, 6991-6999.
- Jalil, A., Mahmud, S.F. 2009. Environment Kuznets curve for CO2 emissions: a cointegration analysis for China. *Energy Policy*, 37, 5167-5172.
- Kao, C. 1999. Spurious regression and residual-based tests for cointegration in panel data. *Journal of Econometrics*, 90, 1-44.
- Kasman, A. Duman, Y.S. 2015. CO2 emissions, economic growth, energy consumption, trade and urbanization in new EU member and candidate countries: A panel data analysis. *Economic Modelling*, 44, 97-103.
- Kim, H. S. & Baek, J. 2011. The environmental consequences of economic growth revisited. *Economics Bulletin*, 31, 1198-1211.
- Kozul-Wright, R. & Fortunato, P. 2012. International trade and carbon emissions. *European Journal of Development Research*, 24, 509-529.
- Lanne, M., Nyberg, H. 2014. Generalized forecast error variance decomposition for linear and nonlinear multivariate models. *School of Economics and Management, University of Aarhus*.
- Larsson, R., Lyhagen, J. Löthgren, M. 2001. Likelihood-based cointegration tests in heterogeneous panels. *The Econometrics Journal*, 109-142.
- Levin, A., Lin, C.F., Chu, C.S.J. 2002. Unit root tests in panel data: asymptotic and finite-sample properties. *Journal of Econometrics*, 108, 1-24.
- Lopez, R. 1994. The environment as a factor of production: the effects of economic growth and trade liberalization. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 27, 163-184.
- Maddala, G.S., Wu, S. 1999. A comparative study of unit root tests with panel data and a new simple test. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 61, 631-652.
- Maddala, G.S. Kim, I.M. 1998. *Unit roots, cointegration, and structural change*, Cambridge University Press.
- Managi, S., Hibiki, A. Tsurumi, T. 2008. Does trade liberalization reduce pollution emissions. *Discussion papers*, 8013.
- Mccoskey, S. Kao, C. 1998. A residual-based test of the null of cointegration in panel data. *Econometric Reviews*, 17, 57-84.
- Menyah, K. Wolde-Rufael, Y. 2010. Energy consumption, pollutant emissions and economic growth in South Africa. *Energy Economics*, 32, 1374-1382.
- Naranpanawa, A. 2011. Does Trade Openness Promote Carbon Emissions? Empirical Evidence from Sri Lanka. *The Empirical Economics Letters*, 10(10), 973-986.
- Niu, S., Ding, Y., Niu, Y., Li, Y., Luo, G. 2011. Economic growth, energy conservation and emissions reduction: A comparative analysis based on panel data for 8 Asian-Pacific countries. *Energy Policy*, 39, 2121-2131.
- OECD, 2014. World Energy Outlook 2014. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/publications/world-energy-outlook-20725302.htm>
- Ozturk, I., Acaravci, A. 2013. The long-run and causal analysis of energy, growth, openness and financial development on carbon emissions in Turkey. *Energy Economics*, 36, 262-267.
- Pedroni, P. 1999. Critical values for cointegration tests in heterogeneous panels with multiple regressors. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 61, 653-670.

- Pedroni, P. 2001. Purchasing power parity tests in cointegrated panels. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 83, 727-731.
- Pedroni, P. 2004. Panel cointegration: asymptotic and finite sample properties of pooled time series tests with an application to the PPP hypothesis. *Econometric Theory*, 20, 597-625.
- Saboori, B., Sulaiman, J. Mohd, S. 2012. Economic growth and CO2 emissions in Malaysia: a cointegration analysis of the environmental Kuznets curve. *Energy Policy*, 51, 184-191.
- Shahbaz, M. 2012. Does trade openness affect long run growth? Cointegration, causality and forecast error variance decomposition tests for Pakistan. *Economic Modelling*, 29, 2325-2339.
- Shahbaz, M., Ozturk, I., Afza, T., Ali, A. 2013. Revisiting the Environmental Kuznets Curve in a Global Economy. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 25, 494-502.
- Shahbaz, M., Khraief, N., Uddin, G.S., Ozturk, I 2014. Environmental Kuznets Curve in an Open Economy: A Bounds Testing and Causality Analysis for Tunisia. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 34, 325-336.
- Shahbaz, M., Dube, S., Ozturk, I., Jalil, A. 2015. Testing the Environmental Kuznets Curve Hypothesis in Portugal. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, 5, 475-481.
- Suri, V., Chapman, D. 1998. Economic growth, trade and energy: implications for the environmental Kuznets curve. *Ecological Economics*, 25, 195-208.
- Takeda, F., Matsuura, K. 2006. Trade and the Environment in East Asia. *Korea and the World Economy*, 7, 33-56.
- Tiwari, A.K., Shahbaz, M. 2014. Revisiting Purchasing Power Parity for India using threshold cointegration and nonlinear unit root test. *Economic Change and Restructuring*, 47, 117-133.
- Uddin, G.S., Bidisha, S.H., Ozturk, I. 2016. Carbon Emissions, Energy Consumption and Economic Growth Relationship in Sri Lanka. *Energy Sources, Part B: Economics, Planning, and Policy*. Forthcoming.
- Westerlund, J. 2007. Testing for error correction in panel data. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 69, 709-748.
- Wiebe, K.S., Bruckner, M., Giljum, S. Lutz, C. 2012. Calculating energy-related CO2 emissions embodied in international trade using a global input-output model. *Economic Systems Research*, 24, 113-139.
- Yildirim, E., Aslan, A., Ozturk, I. 2014. Energy Consumption and GDP in ASEAN Countries: Bootstrap-Corrected Panel and Time Series Causality Tests. *Singapore Economic Review*, 59(2).
- Ahmed, K., Bhattacharya, M., Qazi, A. Q., & Long, W. (2016a). Energy consumption in China and underlying factors in a changing landscape: Empirical evidence since the reform period. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 58, 224-234.
- Tan, Francis, Hooi Hooi Lean, and Habibullah Khan. "Growth and environmental quality in Singapore: Is there any trade-off?." *Ecological Indicators* 47 (2014): 149-155.
- Pearce, D., Barbier, E., & Markandya, A. (2013). *Sustainable development: economics and environment in the Third World*. Routledge
- Ahmed, K., Shahbaz, M., & Kyophilavong, P. (2016b). Revisiting the emissions-energy-trade nexus: evidence from the newly industrializing countries. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 1-16.
- Edwards, S. (1992). Trade orientation, distortions and growth in developing countries. *Journal of development economics*, 39(1), 31-57.
- Shadlen, K. C. (2005). Exchanging development for market access? Deep integration and industrial policy under multilateral and regional-bilateral trade agreements. *Review of International Political Economy*, 12(5), 750-775.

- Steinberg, R. H. (1997). Trade-environment negotiations in the EU, NAFTA, and WTO: regional trajectories of rule development. *American Journal of International Law*, 231-267.
- Ahmed, K., Shahbaz, M., Qasim, A., & Long, W. (2015). The linkages between deforestation, energy and growth for environmental degradation in Pakistan. *Ecological Indicators*, 49, 95-103.
- World Bank (2014), Data on South Aisa (available at <http://data.worldbank.org/region/SAS>)
- Jänicke, M., Mönch, H., Ranneberg, T., & Simonis, U. E. (1989). Structural change and environmental impact: empirical evidence on thirty-one countries in East and West. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 12(2), 99-114.
- Shafik, N., & Bandyopadhyay, S. (1992). *Economic growth and environmental quality: time-series and cross-country evidence* (Vol. 904). World Bank Publications.
- Stern, D. I., Common, M. S., & Barbier, E. B. (1996). Economic growth and environmental degradation: the environmental Kuznets curve and sustainable development. *World development*, 24(7), 1151-1160.
- Hossain, M. S. (2011). Panel estimation for CO 2 emissions, energy consumption, economic growth, trade openness and urbanization of newly industrialized countries. *Energy Policy*, 39(11), 6991-6999.
- Ahmed, K., & Long, W. (2013). An empirical analysis of CO2 emission in Pakistan using EKC hypothesis. *Journal of International Trade Law and Policy*, 12(2), 188-200.
- Ling, C. H., Ahmed, K., Muhamad, R. B., & Shahbaz, M. (2015). Decomposing the trade-environment nexus for Malaysia: what do the technique, scale, composition, and comparative advantage effect indicate?. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 22(24), 20131-20142.
- Qazi, A. Q., Ahmed, K., & Mudassar, M. (2012). *Disaggregate energy consumption and industrial output in Pakistan: an empirical analysis* (No. 2012-29). Economics Discussion Papers.
- Maslin, M. (2008). *Global warming: a very short introduction*. OUP Oxford.
- Shahbaz, M., Hye, Q. M. A., Tiwari, A. K., & Leitão, N. C. (2013). Economic growth, energy consumption, financial development, international trade and CO 2 emissions in Indonesia. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 25, 109-121.
- NASA (2014), Available at: <http://climate.nasa.gov/evidence/> (Accessed. 25.07.2015)
- Ahmed, K., Shahbaz, M., & Kyophilavong, P. (2016c). Revisiting the emissions-energy-trade nexus: evidence from the newly industrializing countries. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 23(8), 7676-7691.
- Ahmed, K. (2015). The sheer scale of China's urban renewal and CO2 emissions: multiple structural breaks, long-run relationship, and short-run dynamics. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 1-12.
- Ahmed, K., Ahmed, N., Shahbaz, M., Ozturk, I., & Long, W. (2016). Modelling trade and climate change policy: a strategic framework for global environmental negotiators. *Journal of Water and Climate Change*, jwc2016123.
- Ahmed, K., & Ozturk, I. (2016). The emission abatement policy paradox in Australia: evidence from energy-emission nexus. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 23(17), 17850-17856.