



Vaasan yliopisto  
UNIVERSITY OF VAASA

**OSUVA** Open  
Science

This is a self-archived – parallel published version of this article in the publication archive of the University of Vaasa. It might differ from the original.

## Prospect of trade and innovation in renewable energy deployment: A comparative analysis between BRICS and MINT Countries

**Author(s):** Ofori, Elvis K.; Bekun, Festus V.; Gyamfi, Bright Akwasi; Ali, Ernest B.; Onifade, Stephen T.; Asongu, Simplice A.

**Title:** Prospect of trade and innovation in renewable energy deployment: A comparative analysis between BRICS and MINT Countries

**Year:** 2024

**Version:** Accepted manuscript

**Copyright** ©2024 Elsevier. This manuscript version is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution–NonCommercial–NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY–NC–ND 4.0) license, <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

### **Please cite the original version:**

Ofori, E. K., Bekun, F. V., Gyamfi, B. A., Ali, E. B., Onifade, S. T. & Asongu, S. A. (2024). Prospect of trade and innovation in renewable energy deployment: A comparative analysis between BRICS and MINT Countries. *Renewable Energy* 229, 120757. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2024.120757>

## **Prospect of Trade and Innovation in Renewable Energy Deployment: A Comparative Analysis Between BRICS and MINT Countries**

### **Abstract**

The need for energy transition via technological innovations cannot be overemphasized as far as meeting climate targets and creating cleaner environments are concerned. The current study thus examines the effect of technological innovation and trade openness on renewable energy while accounting for economic growth, access to electricity, pollution, industrial restructuring, and urbanization using data from 1990 to 2020 for both the MINT and BRICS economies. A series of tests were performed for a robust analysis using second generation econometrics approaches before proceeding to investigate the long-run linkages between renewable energy and the duo of innovation and trade using the Prais-Winsten regression model with panel-corrected standard errors (PCSE) while the Driscoll-Kraay standard errors test was applied for robustness checks. The results, firstly confirm the presence of heterogeneity, cross-sectional dependence, and cointegration among the selected variables. Secondly, technological innovation as a renewable energy determinant demonstrated negative elasticities in both BRICS countries and the full sample, but a positive elasticity in the MINT countries. Thirdly, concerning trade liberalisation, negative elasticities were obtained for the full sample and MINT countries, while the elasticities were positive for the BRICS bloc. Fourthly, the roles of economic growth and environmental pollution reveal a negative impact on renewable energy consumption for all samples. In addition, urbanisation and industrial restructuring promote renewable energy developments only in the BRICS bloc. Overall, the results posit some salient points for policy recommendations as stipulated for the stakeholders and the authorities in the main text.

**Keywords:** Renewable energy, trade liberalization, technological innovation, Prais-Winsten regression, MINT economics and BRICS economics.

## List of Nomenclature

### Abbreviations

### Meaning

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| GDP             | Gross Domestic Product                                |
| WDI             | World Development Indicators                          |
| CO <sub>2</sub> | Carbon dioxide  |
| BP              | British Petroleum                                     |
| CD              | Cross-sectional dependency                            |
| GHGs            | Greenhouse gases                                      |
| OECD            | Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development |
| IPCC            | Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change             |
| R&D             | Research and development                              |
| TSCS            | Time-series cross-sectional                           |
| PCSE            | Panel-corrected standard errors                       |
| RE              | Renewable energy                                      |
| UNEP            | United Nations Environment Program                    |
| ARDL            | Auto Regressive Distributed lag                       |
| BRICS           | Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa        |
| MINT            | Mexico, Indonesia, Nigeria, and Turkey                |
| CADF            | Covariate Augmented Dickey-Fuller                     |
| P-value         | Probability value                                     |

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Amidst the Covid-19 threat, there remains an old-time problem with climate change and its dire effects on environmental quality. Humanity has been engulfed in difficulties concerning environmental change, which perhaps is the greatest threat to the future generations that requires adequate attention within a minimal time (Li & Haneklaus, 2022; Lin et al. 2022). This regurgitates the growing need for energy transition and new technology. To meet international energy and climate targets, an extensive global effort to develop and deploy clean energy technology is urgently needed to cut carbon emissions. Despite the challenges posed by the Covid-19 situation, several recent achievements offer us reason to be optimistic about the world's potential to speed sustainable energy transitions through renewable energy technological innovations to meet global environmental and climate goals (Andrijevic et al., 2020; Pathak et al., 2022; Gyamfi et al. 2022). As such, various developments about the state of Renewable energy (RE) technologies and its utilization have been noted to be a critical aspect of attaining economic growth and sustainable development goals (Khan et al., 2022; Chen et al. 2021; Erdoğ̃an et al. 2021).

Renewable energy expansion could also help advance many other goals. According to a study conducted by the International Council of Science (ICSU, 2017), the establishment of universal energy access and the growth of renewable energy are expected to have a major positive influence on Development Goals. Essentially, renewable energy development is critical for achieving carbon neutrality and overcoming today's energy dilemma and Vidinopoulos et al., (2020) have noted that accelerating the use of renewable energy has become an important path toward carbon neutrality. However, despite the tremendous advances led by global energy transition efforts, the disparity in renewable technology innovation has been identified as worrying for the early industrial evolution (Lin & Chen, 2019; Nicolli & Vona, 2016). Meanwhile, the use of renewable energy can be promoted in a variety of ways as supported by many past studies (Amri, 2019; Ben Aïssa et al., 2014; Wang & Lee, 2022). For instance, through multiple factors including economic growth (Gyimah et al., 2022; Duran et al., 2022), technology innovation (Zhao et al., 2022; Bekun et al. 2022), labor (Ziaei, 2022), capital (Shidong et al., 2022; Gyamfi et al. 2021), population (Yang et al., 2022; Alola et al. 2021), urbanization (Shahbaz et al., 2022; Erdoğan et al., 2022), carbon dioxide emissions (Murshed et al., 2022; Gyamfi et al. 2021), and electric power consumption (He et al., 2021), affect renewable energy consumption.

To increase the usage of renewable energy, an integrated package of actions and regulations must be implemented in accordance with national needs and priorities. In this regard, a comprehensive policy planning centred on technology and trade openness is required to lead the energy infrastructure toward sustainability. Besides, legislation, plan adoption techniques, action programs, and incentive policies can altogether pave way for more remarkable technical advancement and cheaper prices in terms of stimulating a higher level of renewable energy usage. Trade openness is becoming an important emerging macroeconomic determinant in global energy usage and most especially for renewable energy consumption level. Usman and Makhdum (2021), argued that technological innovation is the key driver of renewable adoption and went further to say that technological advancement is the best barometer for preventing environmental damage. Also, it is widely understood that the usage of renewable energy is contingent upon technological transfer, which is inextricably tied to international trade as noted by Ben Aïssa et al., (2014). As such, promoting technological innovation has become a widely accepted strategy for addressing environmental issues such as CO<sub>2</sub> emissions among other greenhouse gas (GHG) emission. In fact,

Cheng et al., (2021) discovered that renewable energy policies in countries with liberalized energy markets are more successful in supporting green innovation.

Currently, the global energy industry is experiencing an accelerating transformation at an astounding level (Yuan et al., 2022). There are a variety of factors contributing to this fast change among which the need to combat climate change stands out. Meanwhile, politicians and governments are also confronted with additional concerns such as maintaining a cheap energy supply, energy security, and improving energy accessibility for everyone (Bhattarai et al., 2022; Chanchangi et al., 2022; Onifade, 2022; Ciaccia, 2022). Therefore, increased regulations, treaties and climate change advocacy are all putting more pressure on governments to promote the use of renewable energy across the globe (Uzar, 2020). This development has thus increased researchers' interest in understanding renewable energy determinants. Among other factors, and a number of empirical studies have been carried out to look into the relationship between renewable energy growth from the trade and innovations perspectives.

Looking at the link between trade and renewable energy first, a copious of research examined the connection between these variables, but often, trade is not viewed as an independent variable but rather as a control variable or threshold factor. Trade openness is generally seen as a crucial tool for economic success as it generally allows for the growth of domestic markets via export expansion (Lane & Pretes, 2020; Khatir et al. 2022; Yussif et al. 2022). But in recent times, the benefits have expanded further to cover environmental issues as it boosts the acquisition of energy-efficient technologies from abroad especially when there are strong bilateral trade relations among countries.

Some studies have found that trade is a primary driver of per capita renewable energy usage. For example, Qamruzzaman & Jianguo (2020) observed that international commerce has a favourable effect on the demand for renewable sources in low-, middle-and high-income nations. Ben Aïssa et al., (2014) used data from 11 African countries between 1980 and 2008 to study the link between GDP, trade, and renewable energy utilisation. The long-run analysis they conducted showed bidirectional correlations between GDP and trade factors, as well as a unidirectional association between renewable energy, trade, and GDP. In the short term, their findings support the bidirectional relationship between trade and GDP while rejecting the idea of a linkage between GDP and renewable energy, and trade and renewable energy. Alam & Murad, (2020) evaluated the influence of economic development, trade openness, and technology progress on renewable

energy in 25 Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) nations. The empirical findings revealed that trade openness and technology advancement had a significant positive impact on OECD nations' adoption of long-term renewable energy.

On the aspect of the link between technology innovation and renewable energy, some studies have been conducted in the literature. Considering the advancements in sciences that have culminated various contributions to humanity, government officials and think tanks around the world have increasingly recognized the relevance of innovations in addressing climate targets especially in the areas of reducing GHGs like CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (Guo et al., 2017). As noted by Alola & Onifade (2022), technological innovation in various energy sources can yield environmental benefits. Their assertions and conclusions were driven by their study of how innovation create a pathway to carbon neutrality in the case of the Finnish economy. However, the link between renewable energy policies and innovation is arguably a newer topic of interest in the growing literature. In practice, the primary goal of RE policies is to produce a particular amount of clean energy demand (Johnstone et al., 2012). According to an empirical study, renewable energy consumption has a cointegration relationship with technological innovation and other external variables (Ji, 2016). This indicates that the stimulating impact of technological innovation on renewable energy output takes time to emerge. Also, in a study by Sohag et al. (2015), an ARDL testing technique was used to examine the impacts of technical innovation on energy usage in Malaysia. They discovered that technological innovation might assist in minimizing energy use by enhancing energy efficiency. Additionally, technological advancements can cushion climate change by introducing energy-efficient equipment and energy advances as concluded in the studies of Shahbaz et al., (2020) and Sharif et al., (2020).

Overall, while environmental technological innovation and trade openness may be mitigation factors for reducing environmental pollution through the promotion of renewables as most of the studies point to their beneficial sides, no specific study has been conducted to understand the role they play in the BRICS and MINT countries. Meanwhile a recommendation of empirical based policies will not be only beneficial for these economic blocs alone but for the global drive for environmental sustainability as these two blocs account for more than half of the entire global GHGs emissions (UNEP, 2021) and the failure to address this development can portend greater colossal environmental disasters in the future (IPCC (2007)). Therefore, the current study contributes to the literature by addressing the unanswered questions concerning the prospects of

trade policy and technological innovation in renewable energy adoption and utilization in these two major economic blocs that account for a substantial share of the global energy demand (BP, 2021).

Furthermore, another important gap in the literature is that most studies on renewable energy primarily focuses on demand perspectives (Samant et al., 2020; Tsoutsos & Stamboulis, 2005); and what impact it has on the debate on climate change and environmental degradation to the exclusion of the supply debate on how renewables can be deployed as an alternative to fossil energy (Elliott, 2015; Madlener & Stagl, 2005). Until now, no study has been conducted to ascertain comparatively the possible effects of trade and technology innovation on renewable deployment in the BRICS and MINT countries thereby making the current study stands out.

From here, the section 2 discusses the methodology and materials, while the results will then be presented and discussed in section 3. The study then concludes by providing policy approaches to be adopted towards promoting sustainable development and clean energy transition in the section 4.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 Data

The study aims at investigating the impact of technology innovation and trade liberalisation on renewable energy consumption in BRICS and MINT countries. However, to avoid the possible biases that may arise from variable omission, the study incorporates a number of control variables. To this end, the utilized data on MINT and BRICS countries covers the period from 1990 to 2020. The data is sourced from the database of the World Bank Development Indicators (WDI, 2021), and the full meaning of the countries included in the MINT and the BRICS blocs have been provided in the list of nomenclature. The availability of data on the variables from the World Bank is updated up until 2020 for majority of the variables. Hence, the current study's sample framework span from 1990 to 2020. The summary of the selected variables, the proxies used to represent them, the unit of these variables in terms of measurement, and their sources are shown in Table 1. The choice of MINT and BRICS countries is justified in the next section. All variables are log transformed to allow for the interpretation of the estimated coefficients as elasticities.

**Table 1.** Description of Variables

| Name of Indicator         | Abbreviation | The unit of Variable Measurement           | Source |
|---------------------------|--------------|--|--------|
| Renewable energy          | Ren          | % of total final energy consumption        | WDI    |
| Technology innovation     | TI           | Patent applications, residents             | WDI    |
| Trade Liberalization      | TR           | Trade (% of GDP)                           | WDI    |
| Economic growth           | Y            | GDP per capita (constant 2015 US\$)        | WDI    |
| Access to Electricity     | ATE          | Access to electricity (% of population)    | WDI    |
| Environmental Pollution   | CO2          | CO2 emissions (kg per 2015 US\$ of GDP)    | WDI    |
| Industrial restructuring. | SER          | Services, value added (constant 2015 US\$) | WDI    |
| Urbanisation              | UR           | Urban population growth (annual %)         | WDI    |

**Source:** Compiled by the authors using data from the World Bank Development Indicators (WDI, 2021).

#### 2.1.1 Dependent Variables

This study aims at understanding what variable promotes renewable energy consumption or otherwise. Hence renewable energy consumption was the targeted dependent variable in the baseline model for the study as seen in Equation (1). The study thus utilizes the data from BRICS and MINT economic blocs for the empirical analysis. Alliances like BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) may be tremendously beneficial if they invest in clean energy and use their combined might to advocate for stricter, legally enforceable protocols on a national and worldwide basis. The BRICS bloc's investment in renewable energy has nearly

tripled in the last decade (Kamat, 2020) and this study seeks to understand in part the likely factors that led to this development. While conducting this analysis, the study also creates a comparative analysis with the MINT countries. Most of the countries in these two blocs apart from being among the fastest emerging economies also share some factors in common like being some of the leading pollutant emitting nations with growing environmental degradation. As such, Akram et al., (2022) noted that the MINT nations (Mexico, Indonesia, Nigeria, and Turkey) should be given special consideration as far as the issues of reducing global carbon emissions are concerned.

### **2.1.2. Independent Variables**

The current study assesses two variables as the major independent variables vis-à-vis the study's outlined aims and objectives, namely trade openness and technology innovation.

1. **Technology innovation:** The modern industrial period has transformed into a quickly evolving society that relies heavily on technical breakthroughs to survive. However, this technology has provided contradicting results on its role in renewable energy use and consequently on the environment quality as noted by Suki et al., (2022). Even the study by Álvarez-Herránz et al., (2017) also revealed an insignificant relationship between innovation and environmental deterioration. The current study thus hypothesises that  $H_0$ : technological innovation increases renewable energy advancement and reduces carbon emissions against the alternative that postulates the contrary view. The study utilises patent information as a proxy as proposed by Lin & Zhu, (2019) and Onifade & Alola, (2022).
2. **Trade openness:** Trade globalization has resulted in significant changes in energy use in several nations (Baek et al., 2009). Some economists have also argued passionately over the environmental repercussions of trade liberalization (han et al., 2022; R. Li et al., 2022). However, the importance of trading in energy consumption, particularly renewable energy, remains a controversial matter (Ali et al., 2021; han et al., 2022). In the current study, trade as a percentage of gross domestic product was utilised for the purpose of the empirical analysis.

### **2.1.3. Control Variables**

1. **Economic Growth:** Some studies have debated the correlation between renewable energy and economic growth (Apergis & Payne, 2010; Balcilar et al., 2018; Koçak & Şarkgüneşi, 2017; Ozcan & Ozturk, 2019). Most of these studies show that growth is

an imperative factor to be considered when assessing the level of progress in renewable energy consumption. Hence, it is prudent to control for this factor when finding alternative resources for environmental quality improvement.

2. Access to energy: Countries that ratified the SDGs commit to achieving cheap and clean energy access by 2030 (Alem & Demeke, 2020). It becomes necessary to add to the energy mix to reach an inclusive number of people that are having access to energy. Rabah, (2005) contends that the demand for primary energy, whether renewable or non-renewable, is mainly driven by low electrification rates and availability of energy.
3. Environmental degradation and Pollution: Carbon emissions are routinely incorporated in models to include the impact of climate change or environmental degradation. Zhang et al., (2021) and Sadorsky, (2009) have shown that the environmental danger posed by high greenhouse gas intensity leads to an increase in renewable energy usage. Hence, carbon emission per capita was used to proxied environmental degradation level.
4. Urbanization: Many researchers have found evidence of urbanization's harmful impacts on the environment (Liu & Bae, 2018; Wang et al., 2018). However, some works have also provided a framework that represents the prospect of urbanization leading to a rise in the consumption of renewable energy (Shahbaz et al., 2022). In this study, urbanization is measured by the fraction of urban residents in the overall population.
5. Industrial Restructuring: An evolving economy can increase the use of energy or otherwise (Miao et al., 2022) and industrialization can be a significant source of pollution and environmental deterioration. Thus, restructuring of industrial arrangements and activities beyond business as usual may promote environmental quality. It has been observed that restructuring is an effective means of achieving green and sustainable development and some studies have argued that service is the best proxy for measuring industrial change as done in this study (Xin-gang & Jin, 2022; Zhou & Li, 2020).

## **2.2. Model Specification and Estimation Approach**

As already mentioned, the aim of the study is to investigate the impact of technology innovation and trade liberalisation on renewable energy development as such, the functional form of this interplay among the variables is provided in equation (1) which represents the first phase of the study's estimations (Model 1). However, given that renewable energy can potentially generate environmental externalities, the study also explores these possible externalities by incorporating environmental pollution as dependent variable in a second

estimation (Model 2) following the functional form of the interplay among variables as seen in Equation (2).

$$\ln Ren_{it} = f(\ln ti_{it}, \ln tr_{it}, \ln y_{it}, \ln ate_{it}, \ln CO_{2it}, \ln ur_{it}, \ln ser_{it}) \quad (1)$$

$$\ln CO_{2it} = f(\ln Ren_{it}, \ln ti_{it}, \ln tr_{it}, \ln y_{it}, \ln ate_{it}, \ln ur_{it}, \ln ser_{it}) \quad (2)$$

In both equation 1 & Equation 2, all variables have been appropriately defined as shown in Table 1 for country  $i$  in period  $t$ . A series of statistical tests were conducted before assessing the long-run estimates for the models. The outcomes of these tests have been detailed out in the discussion section.

The study employs the Prais-Winsten regression model with panel-corrected standard errors (PCSE) and the Driscoll-Kraay standard errors for robustness checks. The PCSE was first proposed by (Beck & Katz, 1995) to address estimation weaknesses of the generalized least squares in analysing time-series cross-sectional data.

This approach carries special advantages that makes the choice of the method beneficial for the current study. Specifically, the PCSEs solves the issues of cross-sectional dependence that has been identified as a major challenge in panel data analysis (Bekun et al. 2021; Caglar et al. 2022; Appiah et al. 2022). Furthermore, the approach also jointly addresses the matters of autocorrelation and heteroskedasticity in time-series cross-sectional (TSCS) data as pointed out in other empirical studies (Kongkuah et al. 2021; Sharmin et al., 2022).

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

As already indicated, the present study employed data spanning 1990 to 2020 for the BRICS and the MINT economies with the original data sourced from the WDI database. Table 2 presents the summary of the variables for a full sample, for the BRICS sample, and then for the MINT countries. All variables are converted into log form. Results for the full sample reveal that industrial construction has an average value of 26.72 at constant 2015 US\$ with a standard deviation of 0.98 which is quite large compared with economic growth (average = 8.31, standard deviation= 0.80) and technology innovation (average = 7.86, standard deviation = 2.20). Also, access to electricity shows an average of 4.41 with a standard deviation of 0.28, while trade liberalization has the average of 3.72 with a standard deviation of 0.36. For renewable energy the average is 3.09 with standard deviation of 0.94 while urbanisation's average is 0.79 with standard deviation of 0.81. Table 3 further reveals marginal differences in

the average values for both BRICS and MINT countries. More specifically, whereas the average values for renewable energy, trade liberalisation, economic growth, and urbanisation are marginally high for MINT countries than BRICS countries, the opposite is the case when technology innovation, access to electricity, environmental pollution, and industrial reconstruction are considered.

The study proceeded to perform a correlation analysis to ascertain the strength of the statistical nexus between the variables. The result from the pairwise correlation analysis is presented in Table 3a, and a quick glance through the table reveals that while some variables exhibit a positive relationship, others display negative nexuses. A positive relationship indicate that the variables may positively influence the dependent variable and vice versa. The results show the absence of possible multicollinearity among variables given that none of the correlation coefficients exceeded 0.75 (Sun et al., 2020).

**Table 2. Summary Statistics**

| Variable           | Inren         | Inti     | Intr     | Iny      | Inate     | Inco2    | Inur     | Inser    |
|--------------------|---------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| <b>Full sample</b> |               |          |          |          |           |          |          |          |
| Obs                | 261           | 253      | 279      | 279      | 247       | 261      | 264      | 278      |
| Mean               | Std. 3.089998 | 7.856508 | 3.726966 | 8.311049 | 4.414016  | -0.37136 | 0.79408  | 26.7242  |
| Dev.               | 0.93741       | 2.197843 | 0.362635 | 0.801871 | 0.2776988 | 0.668158 | 0.818413 | 0.983575 |
| Min                | 1.157038      | 2.484907 | 2.71837  | 6.268178 | 3.306887  | -1.55845 | -4.25649 | 24.69356 |
| Max                | 4.485816      | 14.15198 | 4.705712 | 9.395873 | 4.60517   | 0.792825 | 1.6944   | 29.68514 |
| <b>BRICS</b>       |               |          |          |          |           |          |          |          |
| Obs                | 145           | 153      | 155      | 155      | 136       | 145      | 140      | 154      |
| Mean               | Std. 2.899221 | 8.93573  | 3.635695 | 8.28655  | 4.475524  | -0.05126 | 0.574077 | 27.1088  |
| Dev.               | 0.9794        | 1.951616 | 0.394285 | 0.8623   | 0.1814637 | 0.715953 | 1.017839 | 1.007427 |
| Min                | 1.157038      | 4.927254 | 2.71837  | 6.268178 | 3.908242  | -1.5318  | -4.25649 | 25.23413 |
| Max                | 4.071637      | 14.15198 | 4.705712 | 9.246711 | 4.60517   | 0.792825 | 1.526424 | 29.68514 |
| <b>MINT</b>        |               |          |          |          |           |          |          |          |
| Obs                | 116           | 100      | 124      | 124      | 111       | 116      | 124      | 124      |
| Mean               | 3.328469      | 6.205297 | 3.841055 | 8.341673 | 4.338655  | -0.77149 | 1.04247  | 26.24655 |
| Std. Dev.          | 0.826041      | 1.376203 | 0.280996 | 0.721534 | 0.3487686 | 0.27711  | 0.379636 | 0.707822 |
| Min                | 2.193384      | 2.484907 | 3.03122  | 7.254249 | 3.306887  | -1.55845 | 0.346684 | 24.69356 |
| Max                | 4.485816      | 9.008836 | 4.566286 | 9.395873 | 4.60517   | -0.29018 | 1.6944   | 27.3953  |

**Table 3a. Pairwise Correlation Analysis**

|       | Inren     | Inti     | Intr    | Iny      | Inate | Inco2 | Inur | Inser |
|-------|-----------|----------|---------|----------|-------|-------|------|-------|
| Inren | 1         |          |         |          |       |       |      |       |
| Inti  | -0.340*** | 1        |         |          |       |       |      |       |
| Intr  | -0.521*** | -0.0665  | 1       |          |       |       |      |       |
| Iny   | -0.646*** | 0.202**  | 0.122   | 1        |       |       |      |       |
| Inate | -0.527*** | 0.439*** | 0.218** | 0.724*** | 1     |       |      |       |

|       |           |           |          |           |           |         |          |   |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------|----------|---|
| Inco2 | -0.370*** | 0.265***  | 0.432*** | -0.364*** | -0.212**  | 1       |          |   |
| lnur  | 0.613***  | -0.314*** | -0.0592  | -0.426*** | -0.363*** | -0.109  | 1        |   |
| Inser | -0.202**  | 0.881***  | -0.138   | 0.309***  | 0.536***  | -0.0953 | -0.197** | 1 |

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

### 3.1. Slope Homogeneity Test Results

The current study performed the slope Pesaran–Yamagata homogeneity test to determine whether there is slope homogeneity. From the result presented in Table 3b, we fail to reject the alternate hypothesis of heterogeneity at a 1% level of significance. This implies the presence of heterogeneity among the variables across the panels. This result thus gives credence to employ panel estimators that are robust to heterogeneity across various cross-sections in a panel to produce robust outcomes as reported in Table 3b.

**Table 3b. Pesaran–Yamagata homogeneity test results**

| Test  | Value | p values |
|-------|-------|----------|
| Delta | 7.301 | 0.000*** |
| Oadj. | 9.677 | 0.000*** |

### 3.2. Cross-sectional Dependence.

The outcome of the cross-sectional dependence test is displayed in Table 4. From the results, we fail to reject the alternate hypothesis of cross-sectional dependence. This implies that there is evidence of a spill-over effect across countries in the panel. In other words, a change in any of the variables in one country may have some level of effect in another country. Evidence of a cross-sectional dependence may provide policymakers with the needed information to account for issues pertaining to environmental externalities in policy formation. To control and address the issue of the spill-over effect, panel models that are robust to cross-sectional dependence in the panel data are therefore employed. Doing this improves the robustness of the outcome of such estimations as noted by Eregha et al., (2021).

**Table 4. Cross-sectional Dependency Results**

| Equation (1) | Pesaran CD  | Pesaran scaled LM | Breusch-Pagan LM | Bias-corrected scaled LM |
|--------------|-------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| Inren        | 22.17215*** | 61.91507***       | 561.3668***      | 61.75435***              |
| Inti         | 16.77171*** | 50.89269***       | 467.8388***      | 50.74269***              |
| Intr         | 8.206152*** | 27.90773***       | 272.805***       | 27.75773***              |
| Iny          | 30.05467*** | 102.8215***       | 908.4693***      | 102.6715***              |
| Inate        | 15.30165*** | 48.56134***       | 448.0566***      | 48.41134***              |
| Inco2        | 11.0871***  | 32.56028***       | 312.2831***      | 32.39956***              |
| lnur         | 15.34692*** | 43.80141***       | 407.6673***      | 43.65141***              |

|              |             |             |             |             |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>Inser</b> | 31.50456*** | 113.2846*** | 997.2517*** | 113.1346*** |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|

### 3.3. Panel Unit root Test

The present study used a second-generation panel unit root to address the issue of cross-sectional dependence that was detected in the previous stages. To this end, the study employed the CADF unit root test to ascertain whether unit roots exist among variables as reported in Table 5. The test result show robustness in the presence of the spill-over effect. Thus, it is observed that except for trade liberalisation and economic growth, all other variables are non-stationary at level. However, at the first difference, all variables become stationary at 1%, 5%, and 10%. The result thus provides the basis to choose an estimator to examine the nexus between the variables.

**Table 5. CADF Panel Unit Root Test**

|       | CADF      |           |
|-------|-----------|-----------|
| Model | I(0)      | I(1)      |
| lnren | -1.834    | -3.144*** |
| lni   | 0.132     | -3.275**  |
| lntr  | -2.663**  | -4.326*** |
| lny   | -2.867*** | -2.597*   |
| lnate | -0.546    | -5.979*** |
| lnco2 | -1.368    | -2.752 ** |
| lnur  | 2.322     | -4.249*** |
| lnser | -1.675    | -4.012*** |

### 3.4. Cointegration Test

The summary of the cointegration test results is presented in Table 6. The cointegration test is performed to determine the presence or otherwise of a long run interaction among the study variables. The outcome of the test illustrates a strong robustness considering their high probabilities. This implies that the variables are strongly cointegrated across panels signifying the presence of a long run nexus among the study variables. The result, therefore, provides a strong basis to proceed with the present study objectives.

**Table 6. Model one (lnren lni lntr lny lnate lnco2 lnur lnser)**

| Hypothesized | Fisher Stat.*     |        | Fisher Stat.*         |        |
|--------------|-------------------|--------|-----------------------|--------|
| No. of CE(s) | (from trace test) | Prob.  | (from max-eigen test) | Prob.  |
| None         | 431.7***          | 0.0000 | 122.7***              | 0.0000 |

|           |          |        |          |        |
|-----------|----------|--------|----------|--------|
| At most 1 | 233.7*** | 0.0000 | 237.3*** | 0.0000 |
| At most 2 | 174.7*** | 0.0000 | 83.06*** | 0.0000 |
| At most 3 | 164.2*** | 0.0000 | 90.14*** | 0.0000 |
| At most 4 | 122.5*** | 0.0000 | 76.32*** | 0.0000 |
| At most 5 | 82.55*** | 0.0000 | 61.68*** | 0.0000 |
| At most 6 | 48.14*** | 0.0000 | 31.63**  | 0.0005 |
| At most 7 | 37.02**  | 0.0001 | 37.02**  | 0.0001 |

### 3.5. Long run Determinants of Renewable Energy Consumption

Having established that the variables are heterogeneous across panels with spill-over effect due to the presence of cross-sectional dependence and considering the established possibility of long run interactions among the variables, the study proceeds to examining the impacts of the understudied variables on renewable energy consumption. More emphasis is placed on the roles of technology innovation and trade as the principal targets of investigation for the study's samples (the BRICS, the MINT, and the full sample). The outcomes of the estimations are displayed in Table 7.

Firstly, the result reveals a significantly negative effect of technology innovation on renewable energy consumption for the BRICS countries but a positive and significant influence on renewable energy consumption in the MINT countries. As seen in the Table 7, this result demonstrates that a rise in renewable energy consumption can be linked to a significant investment in technological innovations in MINT countries by the percentage of the innovation elasticities, however, this is not the case in BRICS countries. In other words, the result supports the advocacies for the development and use of green technologies using the MINT countries thereby confirming related findings from extant studies (André et al. 2021; Yasmeen et al., 2022).

As for trade openness, the result again reveals that trade liberalisation is positive and statistically significant at 5% for BRICS countries but statistically insignificant in both the full sample and MINT countries. This shows that trade can play desirable roles in renewable energy consumption and the findings is not a surprise considering that countries like China in the BRICS countries plays a significant role in the global trade levels. The positive sign of trade liberalisation implies that when trade liberalization is promoted by removing or minimizing trade barriers between nations, it can motivate the transfer of green technologies to support renewable energy development. The result can be attributed to the competitive nature of foreign markets. The current result is in tandem with that of Alam & Murad, (2020).

Furthermore, Table 7 reveals that renewable energy consumption decreases with increasing economic growth for all the three samples. The result suggest renewable energy consumption is negatively elastic with respect to economic growth, thus a percentage increase in economic growth decreases renewable energy consumption by 0.84% (for the full sample), 0.68% (for the BRICS), and 1.0% (for the MINT). However, as it can be observed, the estimated coefficient is greater in the BRICS countries than in the full sample and MINT countries. Again, this observation is defensible since most countries in the BRICS bloc rank on the top among the fastest growing economies with fossil energy consumption being a prime driver of economic growth levels (Azam et al. 2021a; Adebayo et al. 2022; Alola et al. 2021). As such, it most likely to observe lesser desirable impacts of growth on renewables specifically in this bloc. The result also resonates with the findings (Alam & Murad, 2020). However the result contradicts the outcomes of (Omri et al. 2015; Tiba & Belaid, 2021) who observed that renewable energy responds positively to the impact of economic growth.

Table 7 further indicates that renewable energy responds negatively to access to electricity in BRICS countries but positively in MINT countries. This implies that while access to electricity decreases renewable energy consumption in BRICS countries, it promotes renewable energy consumption in MINT countries. In addition, the results also signify a negative impact of environmental pollution on renewable energy in all three samples. A cursory inspection of the outcome reveal that the elasticities are marginally large in the full sample than in BRICS and MINT countries. The outcome of the present study is therefore tangential to (Liu et al. 2020; Ullah et al. 2019). Furthermore, the study finds that urbanization promotes renewable energy consumption in the full sample and BRICS countries, though the impact based on the elasticities are marginally higher in BRICS countries than the full sample. Lastly, industrial reconstruction generates a positive impact on renewable energy in the BRICS countries, while a negative impact on renewable is detected in the MINT countries. These discrepancies are explainable giving the high level of industrialization among the countries in the BRICS bloc in contrast to the level of industrialization in the MINT group.

**Table 7. Model 1 Results - Full and sub-samples LnRen dependent variable**

|      | Full Sample             |                          | BRICS                   |                          | MINT                    |                          |
|------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
|      | Panel-corrected<br>Main | Driscoll-Kraay<br>Robust | Panel-corrected<br>Main | Driscoll-Kraay<br>Robust | Panel-corrected<br>Main | Driscoll-Kraay<br>Robust |
| Inti | -0.0043<br>(-0.30)      | 0.0623<br>-1.45          | -0.0867***<br>(-2.87)   | -0.1751**<br>(-2.75)     | 0.0558***<br>-3.68      | 0.0869***<br>-6.99       |
| Intr | -0.0197                 | -0.4024***               | 0.1437**                | 0.3476***                | -0.0352                 | -0.0617                  |

|             |            |            |            |           |            |            |
|-------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|
|             | (-0.60)    | (-2.83)    | -2.28      | -3.02     | (-1.01)    | (-1.50)    |
| lny         | -0.8421*** | -0.7423*** | -0.6769*** | 0.5758*** | -0.9964*** | -1.0645*** |
|             | (-22.34)   | (-21.77)   | (-18.80)   | (-15.70)  | (-16.19)   | (-16.13)   |
| lnate       | -0.1056    | 0.0928     | -0.3391**  | -0.9834** | 0.1613*    | 0.3402***  |
|             | (-1.28)    | -0.94      | (-2.15)    | (-2.39)   | -1.89      | -4.31      |
| lnco2       | -0.8248*** | -0.7628*** | -0.9501*** | 0.9913*** | -0.9989*** | -1.1085*** |
|             | (-19.36)   | (-10.86)   | (-15.74)   | (-12.30)  | (-11.85)   | (-13.20)   |
| lnur        | 0.0968***  | 0.2760***  | 0.1759***  | 0.2509*** | 0.15       | 0.1367     |
|             | -6.09      | -7.01      | -4.64      | -5.12     | -1.25      | -1.04      |
| lnser       | 0.0379     | -0.1518    | 0.1399*    | 0.3461**  | -0.2699*** | -0.3568*** |
|             | -0.91      | (-1.64)    | -1.93      | -2.1      | (-3.77)    | (-8.22)    |
| Constant    | 9.2467***  | 13.4570*** | 6.3408***  | 2.7396    | 16.8812*** | 18.7987*** |
|             | -10.64     | -7.18      | -4.49      | -1        | -9.52      | -13.47     |
| NoB         | 188        | 188        | 108        | 108       | 80         | 80         |
| R-Squared   | 0.967      | 0.901      | 0.963      | 0.966     | 0.992      | 0.989      |
| F Statistic |            | 1135.15    |            | 1399.4    |            | 507.045    |

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$  and NoB denotes number of observations.

### 3.6. Long run Determinants of Environmental Pollution

Table 8 present results from the Prais-Winsten regression model with panel-corrected standard errors for the full samples, the BRICS sample, and the MINT samples following the estimation of Equation (2). The elasticity estimates for the environmental pollution impacts utilizes the CO<sub>2</sub> indices vis-à-vis the exploration of the impacts of all variables (the renewable energy, technology innovation, trade liberalization, economic growth, access to electricity, urbanisation, and industrial restructuring). When the two sample are combined, all the variables are significant except access to electricity. Specifically, a 1% increase in renewable energy, economic growth, and industrial restructuring will correspond to a 0.69%, 0.71%, and 0.09% decline in environmental pollution respectively. This indicates a negative impact of the variables on environmental pollution level. Similar outcomes are observed in the BRICS and MINT countries for renewable energy consumption, and economic growth nexus. In the case of industrial reconstruction, a similar inference is drawn for only the MINT countries. The environmental pollution mitigating role of renewable energy consumption in this study thus confirms findings from Alharthi et al. (2021) and Anwar et al., (2021). Interestingly, the prevailing economic growth levels suggest that it is environmentally friendly for all three samples. This may lend credence to the argument of the EKC hypothesis which many studies have established for countries in this group in some past research (Bekun et al. 2021; Adebayo

et al. 2022). The result however contradicts the finding of (Ahmad et al., 2020; Eregha et al., 2021). To give a better understanding to our result, we assume that economic growth on its own does not promote environmental externalities. As such, we consider economic growth in the context of renewable energy consumption and industrial reconstruction. These countries may be championing the use of clean energies to fuel their industrial reconstruction which may then promote economic growth and exert positive externalities on the environment. Also, we can attribute our result to the fact that countries are making heavy investments to reduce labour-intensive production in their industrialization drive. Economies that thrive on labour-intensive industrialisation are usually not energy-efficient and thus encourage environmental pollution. Contrary to the positive externalities generated from the recently discussed variables, technology innovation, trade liberalisation, and urbanization exert negative environmental externalities on the environment in the full sample. To be precise, trade liberalization, technology innovation, and urbanization all have a positive influence on environmental pollution by the values of their elasticities. Interestingly, a similar trend is observed for technology innovation in both the MINT and BRICS countries. The result confirms the empirical finding of a PMG model in (Erdogan, 2021) but contradicts the works of (Adebayo, 2021; Shan, Yilmaz, Waqas, Dinca, & Veziro, 2021; Villanthenkodath, 2020). The outcome of our results could be attributed to the poor investments and prioritisation of research and development in these countries. Similarly, the outcomes observed in BRICS and MINT countries, gives credence to the elasticities observed in the full sample. The reason could be attributed to weak environmental regulations. That is the lack of enforcement or weak environmental regulations attracts foreign organizations that do not prioritise environmental protection and hence contribute to environmental pollution. This result aligns with (Azam et al., 2021b; Dou, Zhao, Nasir, & Dong, 2021; Li & Haneklaus, 2022) but does not resonate with (Eregha et al., 2021) who reported a negative effect for their full sample but a positive effect for the oil-poor economies. Interestingly, while the positive elasticities recorded for BRICS countries agrees with the full sample, that of the MINT economies is observed as negative. This implies that while urbanisation deteriorates the environment in BRICS countries, it serves a mitigating role in MINT countries. The environmental pollution role of urbanisation recorded in BRICS economies is in consonance with (Erdogan, 2021; Faisal et al., 2021; Lee et al., 2022; Qayyum et al., 2021), whereas the mitigating role found in MINT countries support the study of (Kongkuah et al., 2022) that argues that urbanization reduces environmental pollution through the effect of economy of scale. Thus, due to economy of scale resulting from urbanisation, the overall resource use decreases which then drives down environmental

pollution. Lastly, the estimated elasticities for access to electricity is significant for MINT and BRICS countries but not for the full sample. The result suggests that access to electricity decreases environmental pollution in BRICS countries, however, it promotes pollution in MINT countries. The negative impact of access to electricity in BRICS countries is aligned with (Bilgili et al., 2022). This could be attributed to the hydroelectricity power generation potential of BRICS countries. Indeed, Brazil, Russia, and India are among world's leading hydroelectricity power generators.

**Table 8. Model 2 Results of Full and Sub Sample of BRICS and MINT (LnCO2 dependent variable)**

|             | Full Sample                     |                                 | BRICS                           |                                | MINT                            |                                 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|             | Panel-corrected                 | Driscoll-Kraay                  | Panel-corrected                 | Driscoll-Kraay                 | Panel-corrected                 | Driscoll-Kraay                  |
|             | Main                            | Robust                          | Main                            | Robust                         | Main                            | Robust                          |
| lnren       | -0.6876***<br>(-20.67)          | -0.5720***<br>(-17.20)          | -0.7207***<br>(-14.90)          | -0.5892***<br>(-8.81)          | -0.5759***<br>(-10.34)          | -0.6291***<br>(-13.33)          |
| lnti        | 0.0622***<br>-4.3               | 0.2448***<br>-16.02             | -0.0002<br>(-0.01)              | 0.0814*<br>-1.74               | 0.0521***<br>-3.83              | 0.0665***<br>-5.46              |
| lntr        | 0.0551*                         | 0.1808**                        | 0.3499***                       | 0.5754***                      | 0.0094                          | 0.0197                          |
| lny         | -1.86<br>-0.7087***<br>(-24.95) | -2.42<br>-0.5454***<br>(-11.82) | -6.95<br>-0.5659***<br>(-18.43) | -7.46<br>-0.3950***<br>(-8.39) | -0.33<br>-0.6950***<br>(-12.74) | -0.78<br>-0.7666***<br>(-16.21) |
| lnate       | -0.007<br>(-0.09)               | -0.1924<br>(-1.47)              | -0.2646**<br>(-2.10)            | -0.6974**<br>(-2.11)           | 0.3073***<br>-4.76              | 0.4154***<br>-4.37              |
| lnur        | 0.0192*<br>-1.81                | 0.1375***<br>-5.78              | 0.1377***<br>-5.37              | 0.1898***<br>-5.83             | -0.2338***<br>(-2.70)           | -0.1128<br>(-1.08)              |
| lnser       | -0.0934***<br>(-2.62)           | -0.4871***<br>(-13.51)          | -0.0559<br>(-1.04)              | -0.1980*<br>(-1.78)            | -0.3810***<br>(-8.42)           | -0.3719***<br>(-8.71)           |
| Constant    | 9.4312***<br>-11.63             | 17.1791***<br>-19.52            | 8.0541***<br>-8.29              | 10.4411***<br>-6.57            | 15.5110***<br>-13.23            | 15.3190***<br>-11.01            |
| NoB         | 188                             | 188                             | 108                             | 108                            | 80                              | 80                              |
| R-Squared   | 0.779                           | 0.872                           | 0.906                           | 0.97                           | 0.941                           | 0.954                           |
| F Statistic |                                 | 3314.66                         |                                 | 243.952                        |                                 | 353.039                         |

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$  and NoB denotes number of observations.

#### 4.0. Conclusion

The current study has investigated the role of technology innovation and trade liberalisation on promoting renewable energy consumption in BRICS and MINT countries. However, to minimize variable omission trap and improve the robustness of the overall findings, the study further accounted for more factors including economic growth, access to electricity, urbanisation, and industrial reconstruction as control variables. Thereafter, the study

performed a series of test using second generation approaches before proceeding to investigate the main objective of the study using the Prais-Winsten regression model with panel-corrected standard errors (PCSE) and the Driscoll-Kraay standard errors for robustness checks.

Summarily, the overall findings show that: firstly, there is evidence of heterogeneity among the variables coupled with the confirmation of cross-sectional dependence, and cointegration among. Secondly, the panel result on the determinants of renewable energy reveal negative elasticities for technology innovation in both BRICS countries and the full sample but a positive elasticity in MINT countries. This suggests that while technology innovation is associated with decreasing renewable energy consumption in MINT BRICS countries, the former increases the latter in MINT countries. The outcome recorded in MINT countries is the desired outcome for environmentalists since it implies environmental quality is being improved. This outcome could be because of the significant investments being made by MINT countries with regards to the promotion and development of green technologies. Regardless, the results for the BRICS countries are equally important because it raises questions about the nature of policy measures that needs to be formulated to ensure outcomes similar to the MINT countries are achieved.

With regards trade liberalisation, the outcomes show that the elasticities are negative for the full sample and MINT countries but positive for BRICS countries, suggesting that trade liberalisation reduces environmental pollution through the promotion of renewable energy consumption in BRICS countries. This argument could be premised in the pollution-halo hypothesis whereas a result of strict environmental regulations multinational companies is forced to comply with the environmental regulations of the host country by opting for environmentally friendly energy sources and technologies for their production processes. The outcomes of economic growth and environmental pollution reveal a negative impact on renewable energy consumption for all samples. However, the results reveal a greater impact in MINT countries compared with that of BRICS countries and the full sample. Furthermore, the estimated elasticities for access to electricity shows a decreasing effect in BRICS countries but a positive impact on MINT countries. Lastly, urbanisation and industrial restructuring promotes renewable energy consumption in BRICS countries but inhibits renewable energy consumption in the MINT countries. The inhibiting effect in MINT countries during their industrial restructuring phase would be attributed to their reliance on brown energy sources.

In addition, the study outcome based on the second model suggest that renewable energy, economic growth, and industrial reconstruction all have negative elasticities, which suggest that they general positive externalities on environmental quality in all three samples. However,

whereas BRIC countries generate higher environmental externalities from renewable energy consumption compared to the other samples, MINT countries generate theirs from economic growth and industrial reconstruction compared with BRICS and the full sample. On the contrary, the estimated elasticities for technology innovation and trade liberalisation are positive. This suggest that while technology innovation generates negative environmental externalities in MINT countries and the full sample, that of trade liberalisation is observed in BRIC countries and the full sample. In addition, whereas access to electricity produces positive environmental externalities in BRIC countries, negative externalities are recorded in MINT countries. Finally, urbanisation produces negative environmental externalities in the full sample and BRICS countries but positive externalities in MINT countries.

#### **4.1. Policy Recommendations**

These results evidently portend important information for policy formulation. As such, we make some policy suggestion that could help governments and policymakers to ensure positive environmental externalities are generated from economic and technological progress. Based on the empirical evidence provided in this study, environmental pollution can be curtailed via renewable energy consumption by promoting technology innovation. It is therefore imperative for BRICS countries to scale up investments in technological innovations and development, particularly through research and development (R&D). Specifically, universities and other research institutions should be well funded and given the necessary support to carry out independent and credible research into the development of green technologies that will promote renewable energy consumption and generate positive environmental externalities. The potential of trade liberalisation to promote renewable energy consumption in BRICS countries is indicative of the fact the former can impact positively on environmental quality. It is therefore imperative for authorities to strengthen their countries trade regulations and enforce them to the latter to ensure that foreign companies do not use the host nation as a dumping site for technologies that work against the promotion of renewable energy consumption. This is policy measure is justified by the pollution mitigating role of renewable energy as seen in the second model.

Furthermore, if appropriate policy measures are formulated to support renewable energy consumption via technology innovation and trade liberalisation, economic growth can produce positive environmental externalities as shown by the outcomes of the second model. Thus, governments must harmonise their trade and economic growth policies to ensure that they gravitate towards environmentally friendly economic growth trends. We believe that the policy

suggestion for the technology innovation is also beneficial for access to electricity. Thus, promoting technology innovation would likely influence access to electricity generated from renewable sources which will in turn result in an increase in renewable energy consumption. Finally, given that achieving favourable environmental quality requires a collective effort, foreign organizations should take advantage of the opportunities provided through trade liberalisation to invest in innovative green technologies in host economies, to generate positive environmental externalities on a global scale.

### **Limitations and Direction for Future Studies**

The current study only focuses on these three economic blocs. A major limitation is that findings may not be generalizable in some circumstances due to several factors like differences in both economic and energy phenomena across the globe from one country or regions to another. Hence, future studies can strategically explore the determinants of renewable energy usage for other blocs across the globe within the established framework of the current study while keeping the analysis period wider. It is also possible to explore the advantages of any other beneficial empirical approaches for a study like this to broaden policy recommendation for renewable energy development in the future.

### **REFERENCES**

- Adebayo, T. S. (2021). *Toward a sustainable environment : nexus between consumption-based carbon emissions , economic growth , renewable energy and technological innovation in Brazil*. 52272–52282.
- Ahmad, M., Khattak, S. I., Khan, A., & Rahman, Z. U. (2020). Innovation, foreign direct investment (FDI), and the energy–pollution–growth nexus in OECD region: a simultaneous equation modeling approach. *Environmental and Ecological Statistics*, 27(2), 203–232. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10651-020-00442-8>
- Adebayo, T. S., Onifade, S. T., Alola, A. A., & Muoneke, O. B. (2022). Does it take international integration of natural resources to ascend the ladder of environmental quality in the newly industrialized countries? *Resources Policy*, 76, 102616. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2022.102616>
- Alam, M., & Murad, W. (2020). The impacts of economic growth , trade openness and technological progress on renewable energy use in organization for economic co- operation and development countries. *Renewable Energy*, 145, 382–390. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2019.06.054>
- Alharthi, M., Dogan, E., & Taskin, D. (2021). Analysis of CO2 emissions and energy consumption by sources in MENA countries: evidence from quantile regressions. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 28(29), 38901–38908. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-13356-0>
- Alola, A. A., & Onifade, S. T. (2022). Energy innovations and pathway to carbon neutrality in Finland. *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, 52, 102272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seta.2022.102272>
- Alola, A. A., Onifade, S. T., Erdoğan, S., & Acet, H. (2021). Environmental aspect of energy transition and urbanization in the OPEC member states. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 28(14), 17158-17169. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-020-12181-1>
- Alola, A. A., Adebayo, T. S., & Onifade, S. T. (2021). Examining the dynamics of ecological footprint in China with spectral Granger causality and quantile-on-quantile approaches. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, 1-14.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13504509.2021.1990158>

- André, P., Elias, C., & Sara, S. (2021). Assessing the linkages between recycling , renewable energy and sustainable development : evidence from the OECD countries. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 23(7), 9766–9791. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-020-00780-4>
- Anwar, A., Sinha, A., Sharif, A., Siddique, M., Irshad, S., Anwar, W., & Malik, S. (2021). The nexus between urbanization, renewable energy consumption, financial development, and CO2 emissions: evidence from selected Asian countries. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 3(8), 151–161. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-021-01716-2>
- Appiah, M., Onifade, S. T., & Gyamfi, B. A. (2022). Building Critical Infrastructures: Evaluating the Roles of Governance and Institutions in Infrastructural Developments in Sub-Sahara African Countries. Volume 46, Issue 4 Evaluation Review, <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0193841X221100370>
- Azam, A., Rafiq, M., Shafique, M., Zhang, H., Ateeq, M., & Yuan, J. (2021). Analyzing the relationship between economic growth and electricity consumption from renewable and non-renewable sources: Fresh evidence from newly industrialized countries. *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, 44, 100991.
- Azam, M., Ur, Z., & Yusnidah, R. (2021). openness , and carbon emissions : empirical evidence from OPEC economies. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, (0123456789). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-021-02019-2>
- Beck, N., & Katz, J. N. (1995). What to do ( and not to do ) with Time-Series Cross-Section Data. *He American Political Science Review*, 89(3), 634–647.
- Bekun, F. V., Onifade, S. T., Agboola, P., & Altuntaş, M. (2022). How do technological innovation and renewables shape environmental quality advancement in emerging economies: An exploration of the E7 bloc?. *Sustainable Development*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/sd.2366>
- Bekun, F. V., Gyamfi, B. A., Onifade, S. T., & Agboola, M. O. (2021). Beyond the environmental Kuznets Curve in E7 economies: Accounting for the combined impacts of institutional quality and renewables. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 127924. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.127924>
- British Petroleum BP. (2021). Statistical Review of World Energy June 2020. Available at: <http://www.bp.com/statisticalreview> . Accessed September 2022.
- Bilgili, F., Ozturk, I., Kocak, E., Kuskaya, S., & Cingoz, A. (2022). Energy & Buildings The nexus between access to electricity and CO 2 damage in Asian Countries : The evidence from quantile regression models. *Energy & Buildings*, 256, 111761. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2021.111761>
- Caglar, A. E., Zafar, M. W., Bekun, F. V., & Mert, M. (2022). Determinants of CO2 emissions in the BRICS economies: The role of partnerships investment in energy and economic complexity. *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, 51, 101907.
- Chen, C., Hu, Y., Karuppiah, M., & Kumar, P. M. (2021). Artificial intelligence on economic evaluation of energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies. *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, 47, 101358.
- Dou, Y., Zhao, J., Nasir, M., & Dong, K. (2021). Assessing the impact of trade openness on CO 2 emissions : Evidence from China-Japan-ROK FTA countries. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 296(July), 113241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2021.113241>
- Erdogan, S. (2021). Dynamic nexus between technological innovation and buildings Sector ' s carbon emission in BRICS countries. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 293(March), 112780. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2021.112780>
- Erdoğan, S., Onifade, S. T., Altuntaş, M., & Bekun, F. V. (2022). Synthesizing urbanization and carbon emissions in Africa: how viable is environmental sustainability amid the quest for economic growth in a globalized world?. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-18829-4>
- Eregha, P. B., Adeleye, B. N., & Ogunrinola, I. (2021). Pollutant emissions, energy use and real output in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) countries. *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 44(1), 64–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpolmod.2021.10.002>
- Faisal, F., Pervaiz, R., Ozatac, N., & Tursoy, T. (2021). Exploring the relationship between carbon dioxide emissions , urbanisation and financial deepening for Turkey using the symmetric and

- asymmetric causality approaches. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 23(12), 17374–17402. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-021-01385-1>
- Kongkuah, M., Yao, H., Fongjong, B. B., & Agyemang, A. O. (2021). The role of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and economic growth in energy consumption: empirical evidence from Belt and Road and OECD countries. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 28(18), 22488–22509. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-020-11982-8>
- Kongkuah, M., Yao, H., & Yilanci, V. (2022). The relationship between energy consumption , economic growth , and - CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in China : the role of urbanisation and international trade. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 24(4), 4684–4708. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-021-01628-1>
- Khatir, A. Q., Ay, A., Onifade, S. T., & Canitez, M. (2022). Reviewing Trade Openness, Domestic Investment, and Economic Growth Nexus: Contemporary Policy Implications for the MENA region. *Revista Finanzas y Política Económica*, 14(2). <https://doi.org/10.14718/revfinanzpolitecon.v14.n2.2022.7>
- Lee, H. S., Arestis, P., Chong, S. C., Yap, S., & Sia, B. K. (2022). The heterogeneous effects of urbanisation and institutional quality on greenhouse gas emissions in Belt and Road Initiative countries. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, (29), 1087–1105.
- Li, B., & Haneklaus, N. (2022). Reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in G7 countries : The role of clean energy consumption , trade openness and urbanization. *Energy Reports*, 8, 704–713. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egyr.2022.01.238>
- Lin, C. Y., Chau, K. Y., Moslehpour, M., Linh, H. V., Duong, K. D., & Ngo, T. Q. (2022). Factors influencing the sustainable energy technologies adaptation in ASEAN countries. *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, 53, 102668.
- Liu, J. L., Ma, C. Q., Ren, Y. S., & Zhao, X. W. (2020). Do Real Output and Renewable Energy Consumption BRICS Countries. *Energies*, 13(4), 960.
- Omri, A., Ben, N., & Sassi-tmar, A. (2015). Modeling the causal linkages between nuclear energy , renewable energy and economic growth in developed and developing countries. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 42, 1012–1022. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2014.10.046>
- Qayyum, M., Ali, M., Nizamani, M. M., Li, S., Yu, Y., & Jahanger, A. (2021). Nexus between Financial Development, Renewable Energy Consumption, Technological Innovations and CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions: The Case of India. *Energies*, 14(4505).
- Shan, S., Yilmaz, S., Waqas, H., Dinca, G., & Veziro, A. R. (2021). Role of green technology innovation and renewable energy in carbon neutrality : A sustainable investigation from Turkey. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 294(March), 113004. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2021.113004>
- Sharmin, M., Rani, S., & Tariqul, D. (2022). Measuring economic , social and environmental wellbeing of Asian economies. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 18591–18604. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-16999-1>
- Sun, H., Samuel, C. A., Amissah, J. C. K., Taghizadeh-Hesary, F., & Mensah, I. A. (2020). Non-linear nexus between CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and economic growth: A comparison of OECD and B&R countries. *Energy*, 212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2020.118637>
- Tiba, S., & Belaid, F. (2021). MOdeling the nexus between sustainable development and renewable energy : the african perspectives. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 35(1), 307–329. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joes.12401>
- Ullah, I., Rehman, A., & Ullah, F. (2019). Nexus between trade , CO<sub>2</sub> emissions , renewable energy , and health expenditure in Pakistan. *International Journal of Health Plann Mgmt*, (September), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hpm.2912>
- Villanthenkodath, M. A. (2020). *Technological innovation and environmental quality nexus in India : Does inward remittance matter ?* (June). <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2291>
- Yasmeen, R., Zhaohui, C., Hassan Shah, W. U., Kamal, M. A., & Khan, A. (2022). Exploring the role of biomass energy consumption, ecological footprint through FDI and technological innovation in B&R economies: A simultaneous equation approach. *Energy*, 244, 122703. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2021.122703>
- Yussif, A. R. B., Onifade, S. T., Ay, A., Canitez, M., & Bekun, F. V. (2022). Modeling the volatility of exchange rate and international trade in Ghana: empirical evidence from GARCH and EGARCH.

- Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEAS-11-2020-0187>
- Akram, R., Umar, M., Xiaoli, G., & Chen, F. (2022). Dynamic linkages between energy efficiency, renewable energy along with economic growth and carbon emission. A case of MINT countries an asymmetric analysis. *Energy Reports*, 8, 2119-2130. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egy.2022.01.153>
- Alem, Y., & Demeke, E. (2020). The persistence of energy poverty: A dynamic probit analysis. *Energy Economics*, 90, 104789. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2020.104789>
- Ali, S., Dogan, E., Chen, F., & Khan, Z. (2021). International trade and environmental performance in top ten-emitters countries: The role of eco-innovation and renewable energy consumption. *Sustainable Development*, 29(2), 378-387. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2153>
- Álvarez-Herránz, A., Balsalobre, D., Cantos, J. M., & Shahbaz, M. (2017). Energy Innovations-GHG Emissions Nexus: Fresh Empirical Evidence from OECD Countries. *Energy Policy*, 101, 90-100. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2016.11.030>
- Amri, F. (2019). Renewable and non-renewable categories of energy consumption and trade: Do the development degree and the industrialization degree matter? *Energy*, 173, 374-383. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2019.02.114>
- Andrijevic, M., Schleussner, C.-F., Gidden, M. J., McCollum, D. L., & Rogelj, J. (2020). COVID-19 recovery funds dwarf clean energy investment needs. *Science*, 370(6514), 298-300. doi:[doi:10.1126/science.abc9697](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abc9697)
- Apergis, N., & Payne, J. E. (2010). Renewable energy consumption and economic growth: evidence from a panel of OECD countries. *Energy Policy*, 38(1), 656-660.
- Baek, J., Cho, Y., & Koo, W. W. (2009). The environmental consequences of globalization: A country-specific time-series analysis. *Ecological Economics*, 68(8), 2255-2264. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2009.02.021>
- Balcilar, M., Ozdemir, Z. A., Ozdemir, H., & Shahbaz, M. (2018). The renewable energy consumption and growth in the G-7 countries: Evidence from historical decomposition method. *Renewable Energy*, 126, 594-604. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2018.03.066>
- Ben Aïssa, M. S., Ben Jebli, M., & Ben Youssef, S. (2014). Output, renewable energy consumption and trade in Africa. *Energy Policy*, 66, 11-18. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.11.023>
- Erdoğan, S., Alagöz, M., Onifade, S. T., & Bekun, F. V. (2021). Renewables as a pathway to environmental sustainability targets in the era of trade liberalization: Empirical evidence from Turkey and the Caspian countries. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-13684-1>
- Bhattacharai, U., Maraseni, T., & Apan, A. (2022). Assay of renewable energy transition: A systematic literature review. *Science of The Total Environment*, 833, 155159. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.155159>
- Chanchari, Y. N., Adu, F., Ghosh, A., Sundaram, S., & Mallick, T. K. (2022). Nigeria's energy review: Focusing on solar energy potential and penetration. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*. doi:[10.1007/s10668-022-02308-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-022-02308-4)
- Cheng, C., Ren, X., Dong, K., Dong, X., & Wang, Z. (2021). How does technological innovation mitigate CO2 emissions in OECD countries? Heterogeneous analysis using panel quantile regression. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 280, 111818. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.111818>
- Ciaccia, F. (2022). Technology Innovation in the Energy Sector and Climate Change: The Role of Governments and Policies. In S. Valaguzza & M. A. Hughes (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary Approaches to Climate Change for Sustainable Growth* (pp. 159-179). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Duran, M. S., Bozkaya, Ş., Onifade, S. T., & Kaya, M. G. (2022). Nuclear energy consumption and energy-driven growth nexus: a system GMM analysis of 27 nuclear utilizing countries across the globe. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-22951-8>
- Elliott, D. (2015). *Green Energy Futures: A Big Change for the Good*: Springer.
- Guo, L. I., Qu, Y., & Tseng, M.-L. (2017). The interaction effects of environmental regulation and technological innovation on regional green growth performance. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 162, 894-902. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.05.210>

- Gyimah, J., Yao, X., Tachega, M. A., Sam Hayford, I., & Opoku-Mensah, E. (2022). Renewable energy consumption and economic growth: New evidence from Ghana. *Energy*, 248, 123559. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2022.123559>
- Gyamfi, B. A., Onifade, S. T., Nwani, C., & Bekun, F. V. (2021). Accounting for the combined impacts of natural resources rent, income level, and energy consumption on environmental quality of G7 economies: a panel quantile regression approach. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-15756-8>
- Gyamfi, B. A., Onifade, S. T., Ilham, H. & Bekun, F. V. (2021). Re-examining the Roles of Economic Globalization on Environmental Degradation in the E7 Economies: Are Human Capital, Urbanization, and Total Natural Resources Essential Components? *Resources Policy*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2021.102435>
- Gyamfi, B. A., Onifade, S. T., Bekun, F. V., & Altuntaş, M. (2022). Significance of Air Transport to Tourism-Induced Growth Hypothesis in E7 Economies: Exploring the Implications for Environmental Quality. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal*, 70(3), 339-353. <https://hrcak.srce.hr/279096>
- han, J., Zeeshan, M., Ullah, I., Rehman, A., & Afridi, F. E. A. (2022). Trade openness and urbanization impact on renewable and non-renewable energy consumption in China. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*. doi:10.1007/s11356-021-18353-x
- He, R.-f., Zhong, M.-r., & Huang, J.-b. (2021). The dynamic effects of renewable-energy and fossil-fuel technological progress on metal consumption in the electric power industry. *Resources Policy*, 71, 101985. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2021.101985>
- ICSU, A. (2017). Guide To SDG Interactions: From Science to implementation, DJ Griggs, M. Nilsson, A. Stevance, D. McCollum. *International Council for Science, Paris*.
- IPCC, (2007). Summary for Policymakers. In: *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.
- Ji, J.-B. G. Q. (2016). Technological innovation and renewable energy development: evidence based on patent counts. *International Journal of Global Environmental Issues*, 15(3), 217-234. doi:10.1504/ijgenvi.2016.076945
- Johnstone, N., Haščič, I., Poirier, J., Hemar, M., & Michel, C. (2012). Environmental policy stringency and technological innovation: evidence from survey data and patent counts. *Applied Economics*, 44(17), 2157-2170. doi:10.1080/00036846.2011.560110
- Kamat, T. (2020). Renewable Energy: Why BRICS Needs to Take Charge.
- Khan, S. A. R., Quddoos, M. U., Akhtar, M. H., Rafique, A., Hayat, M., Gulzar, S., & Yu, Z. (2022). Re-investigating the nexuses of renewable energy, natural resources and transport services: a roadmap towards sustainable development. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 29(9), 13564-13579. doi:10.1007/s11356-021-16702-4
- Koçak, E., & Şarkgüneşi, A. (2017). The renewable energy and economic growth nexus in Black Sea and Balkan countries. *Energy Policy*, 100, 51-57. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2016.10.007>
- Lane, J. M., & Pretes, M. (2020). Maritime dependency and economic prosperity: Why access to oceanic trade matters. *Marine Policy*, 121, 104180.
- Li, S., Yu, Y., Jahanger, A., Usman, M., & Ning, Y. (2022). The Impact of Green Investment, Technological Innovation, and Globalization on CO2 Emissions: Evidence From MINT Countries. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, 10. doi:10.3389/fenvs.2022.868704
- Lin, B., & Chen, Y. (2019). Does electricity price matter for innovation in renewable energy technologies in China? *Energy Economics*, 78, 259-266. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2018.11.014>
- Lin, B., & Zhu, J. (2019). Determinants of renewable energy technological innovation in China under CO2 emissions constraint. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 247, 662-671. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.06.121>
- Liu, X., & Bae, J. (2018). Urbanization and industrialization impact of CO2 emissions in China. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 172, 178-186.

- Madlener, R., & Stagl, S. (2005). Sustainability-guided promotion of renewable electricity generation. *Ecological Economics*, 53(2), 147-167. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2004.12.016>
- Miao, Y., Razaq, A., Adebayo, T. S., & Awosusi, A. A. (2022). Do renewable energy consumption and financial globalisation contribute to ecological sustainability in newly industrialized countries? *Renewable Energy*.
- Murshed, M., Saboori, B., Madaleno, M., Wang, H., & Doğan, B. (2022). Exploring the nexuses between nuclear energy, renewable energy, and carbon dioxide emissions: The role of economic complexity in the G7 countries. *Renewable Energy*, 190, 664-674. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2022.03.121>
- Nicolli, F., & Vona, F. (2016). Heterogeneous policies, heterogeneous technologies: The case of renewable energy. *Energy Economics*, 56, 190-204. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2016.03.007>
- Ozcan, B., & Ozturk, I. (2019). Renewable energy consumption-economic growth nexus in emerging countries: A bootstrap panel causality test. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 104, 30-37. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2019.01.020>
- Onifade, S. T., & Alola, A. A. (2022). Energy transition and environmental quality prospects in leading emerging economies: The role of environmental-related technological innovation. *Sustainable Development*. 2022/5/29 <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2346>
- Onifade, S.T. (2022). Retrospecting on resource abundance in leading oil-producing African countries: how valid is the environmental Kuznets curve (EKC) hypothesis in a sectoral composition framework? *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*. Environmental Science and Pollution Research. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-19575-3>
- Pathak, S. K., Sharma, V., Chougule, S. S., & Goel, V. (2022). Prioritization of barriers to the development of renewable energy technologies in India using integrated Modified Delphi and AHP method. *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, 50, 101818.
- Qamruzzaman, M., & Jianguo, W. (2020). The asymmetric relationship between financial development, trade openness, foreign capital flows, and renewable energy consumption: Fresh evidence from panel NARDL investigation. *Renewable Energy*, 159, 827-842. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2020.06.069>
- Rabah, K. V. O. (2005). Integrated solar energy systems for rural electrification in Kenya. *Renewable Energy*, 30(1), 23-42. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2004.04.011>
- Sadorsky, P. (2009). Renewable energy consumption, CO2 emissions and oil prices in the G7 countries. *Energy Economics*, 31(3), 456-462. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2008.12.010>
- Samant, S., Thakur-Wernz, P., & Hatfield, D. E. (2020). Does the focus of renewable energy policy impact the nature of innovation? Evidence from emerging economies. *Energy Policy*, 137, 111119. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2019.111119>
- Shahbaz, M., Abbas Rizvi, S. K., Dong, K., & Vo, X. V. (2022). Fiscal decentralization as new determinant of renewable energy demand in China: The role of income inequality and urbanization. *Renewable Energy*, 187, 68-80. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2022.01.064>
- Shahbaz, M., Raghutla, C., Song, M., Zameer, H., & Jiao, Z. (2020). Public-private partnerships investment in energy as new determinant of CO2 emissions: The role of technological innovations in China. *Energy Economics*, 86, 104664. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2020.104664>
- Sharif, A., Baris-Tuzemen, O., Uzuner, G., Ozturk, I., & Sinha, A. (2020). Revisiting the role of renewable and non-renewable energy consumption on Turkey's ecological footprint: Evidence from Quantile ARDL approach. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 57, 102138. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2020.102138>
- Shidong, L., Chupradit, S., Maneengam, A., Suksatan, W., Phan The, C., & Nguyen Ngoc, Q. (2022). The moderating role of human capital and renewable energy in promoting economic development in G10 economies: Evidence from CUP-FM and CUP-BC methods. *Renewable Energy*, 189, 180-187. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2022.02.053>
- Sohag, K., Begum, R. A., Abdullah, S. M. S., & Jaafar, M. (2015). Dynamics of energy use, technological innovation, economic growth and trade openness in Malaysia. *Energy*, 90, 1497-1507. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2015.06.101>

- Suki, N. M., Suki, N. M., Sharif, A., Afshan, S., & Jermstittiparsert, K. (2022). The role of technology innovation and renewable energy in reducing environmental degradation in Malaysia: A step towards sustainable environment. *Renewable Energy*, *182*, 245-253. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2021.10.007>
- Tsoutsos, T. D., & Stamboulis, Y. A. (2005). The sustainable diffusion of renewable energy technologies as an example of an innovation-focused policy. *Technovation*, *25*(7), 753-761. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2003.12.003>
- UNEP (2021). United Nations Environment Program: Emissions Gap Report. The Heat Is On – A World of Climate Promises Not Yet Delivered. Nairobi. Available at [www.unep.org/resources/emissions-gap-report-2021](http://www.unep.org/resources/emissions-gap-report-2021) Accessed September 2022.
- Usman, M., & Makhdam, M. S. A. (2021). What abates ecological footprint in BRICS-T region? Exploring the influence of renewable energy, non-renewable energy, agriculture, forest area and financial development. *Renewable Energy*, *179*, 12-28. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2021.07.014>
- Uzar, U. (2020). Political economy of renewable energy: Does institutional quality make a difference in renewable energy consumption? *Renewable Energy*, *155*, 591-603. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2020.03.172>
- Vidinopoulos, A., Whale, J., & Hutfilter, U. F. (2020). Assessing the technical potential of ASEAN countries to achieve 100% renewable energy supply. *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, *42*, 100878.
- Wang, E.-Z., & Lee, C.-C. (2022). The impact of clean energy consumption on economic growth in China: Is environmental regulation a curse or a blessing? *International Review of Economics & Finance*, *77*, 39-58. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iref.2021.09.008>
- Wang, S., Li, G., & Fang, C. (2018). Urbanization, economic growth, energy consumption, and CO2 emissions: Empirical evidence from countries with different income levels. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *81*, 2144-2159. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.06.025>
- World Development Indicators, WDI (2020). <https://data.worldbank.org/> Accessed February 2022.
- Xin-gang, Z., & Jin, Z. (2022). Industrial restructuring, energy consumption and economic growth: Evidence from China. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *335*, 130242. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.130242>
- Yang, X., Li, N., Mu, H., Ahmad, M., & Meng, X. (2022). Population aging, renewable energy budgets and environmental sustainability: Does health expenditures matter? *Gondwana Research*, *106*, 303-314. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gr.2022.02.003>
- Yuan, X., Su, C.-W., Umar, M., Shao, X., & Lobonţ, O.-R. (2022). The race to zero emissions: Can renewable energy be the path to carbon neutrality? *Journal of Environmental Management*, *308*, 114648. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2022.114648>
- Zhang, M., Zhang, S., Lee, C.-C., & Zhou, D. (2021). Effects of trade openness on renewable energy consumption in OECD countries: New insights from panel smooth transition regression modelling. *Energy Economics*, *104*, 105649. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2021.105649>
- Zhao, G., Zhou, P., & Wen, W. (2022). What cause regional inequality of technology innovation in renewable energy? Evidence from China. *Applied Energy*, *310*, 118464. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2021.118464>
- Zhou, A., & Li, J. (2020). The nonlinear impact of industrial restructuring on economic growth and carbon dioxide emissions: a panel threshold regression approach. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *27*(12), 14108-14123. doi:[10.1007/s11356-020-07778-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-020-07778-5)
- Ziaei, S. M. (2022). The impacts of household social benefits, public expenditure on labour markets, and household financial assets on the renewable energy sector. *Renewable Energy*, *181*, 51-58. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2021.09.017>