1. The relationship between income and environmental degradation is mostly spurious.

A relationship is spurious when there is no causal flow from the explanatory variable to the dependent variable.

Example:

High temperature

ice-cream sales shark attacks

Any correlation between ice-cream sales and shark attacks here will be spurious, as there is no causal flow from one variable to the other.

Example 2:

Short-sightedness

Overconsumption

Income environmental degradation

Again, there is no causal flow from income towards degradation or vice versa. One may argue that the relation between income and overconsumption is bi-directional, that more income may cause more greed and subsequent consumption, but this relation, if taken to be true, will only be of minor importance, and you will need to use simultaneous equations to capture it anyhow.

1. Our concern is environmental degradation, not emissions. If an activity causes degradation, it is undesirable, *regardless of whether or not it increases emissions*. Emissions only borrow their importance from the relation they have with degradation.

Two countries may have equal emissions, but one may be more productive, hence causing less net degradation. If we consider emissions alone, it will seem as if the two are ranked equal.

As another example, compare a soccer match with a scientific endeavor where both have equal emissions. The former will be far less productive than the latter, and thus more detrimental to the environment. Yet the emissions are equal.

Insisting on using emissions is akin to deliberately missing the forest for the trees. You’re not taking the whole picture into account, and yet you are trying to draw inferences for the whole. Considering that all of this could’ve easily been avoided using degradation, it’s hard to see the justification.

1. You need simultaneous equations to capture the feedback loop between degradation and consumption.
2. Multicollinearity. Lumping too many variables into a single equation, in conjunction with all the missing data will lead to somewhat unreliable results. You need to reduce the number of variables, or at least highlight the flaw, rather than attempting to justify and mask it.

Again, a simultaneous system of equations is much preferred for this problem.

1. Increasing human capital, and in particular its qualitative aspects such as intelligence and wisdom, will at some point result in less degradation by definition. Not only that, the effect of intelligence will disproportionately tower over all other chosen variables excluding consumption. Hence, it does not make sense to omit it. On the other hand, we don’t have data on human cooperation and intelligence at the level of the species as a whole, which is why you can’t really approach this problem with a regression in the first place. (Unless you use simulations or draw on data from human subgroups).

Insisting on using a linear relationship (rather than second order) here is once again zooming in to miss the bigger picture. (Zoom in and the graph will seem linear)

Dear author, my suggestion for you is one of the following: Either revise the manuscript completely, or at the very least, highlight these points, prioritize them and make sure to deliver the message that your study contains all these fundamental flaws and mistakes.

**Words and grammar:**

Page 20 line 9 : Money-centered economies and ~~people~~ individualism

Line 10: Both ~~people~~ individuals and companies

You’ve commented that GHG per capita is analyzed as the dependent variable. However, both throughout the text (such as pages 10-11) and in the diagrams, total GHG has been used.