

“A Review of the Energy Policy in Greece in the Last 50 Years and Its Implications for Prosperity”

by G.-Fivos Sargentis, Romanos Ioannidis, Nikos Mamassis, Vassilios Zoukos, & Demetris Koutsoyiannis

Prehistory of the rejections of paper

First rejection

Subject: Decision on submission to Journal of King Saud University - Engineering Sciences
Date: Sun, 7 Jul 2024 06:37:34 +0000
From: Journal of King Saud University - Engineering Sciences <em@editorialmanager.com>
Reply-To: Journal of King Saud University - Engineering Sciences <support@elsevier.com>
To: G.-Fivos Sargentis <fivos@itia.ntua.gr>

Manuscript Number: JKSUES-D-24-00319

A review of the energy policy in Greece in the last 50 years and its implications to prosperity

Dear Dr Sargentis,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Journal of King Saud University - Engineering Sciences.

I regret to inform you that the reviewers recommend against publishing your manuscript, and I must therefore reject it. My comments, and any reviewer comments, are below.

For alternative journals that may be more suitable for your manuscript, please refer to our Journal Finder (http://journalfinder.elsevier.com?dgcid=eman:jf-editor-reject-norev_email).

We appreciate you submitting your manuscript to Journal of King Saud University - Engineering Sciences and thank you for giving us the opportunity to consider your work.

Kind regards,
Anis Fakeeha
Editor-in-Chief

Journal of King Saud University - Engineering Sciences
Editor and Reviewer comments:

- 1- correct and send as new submission
- 2- the paper is not in journal format (references in text and list)
- 3- TO BE SURE THE PAPER IN LINE WITH OUR JOURNAL, CITE OUR JOURNAL
- 4-THE FINAL PAPER MUST BE 10 PAGES (TWO COLUMN PER PAGE INCLUDING ALL FIGURES AND TABLES
- 5-ADD CONFLICT OF INTEREST STMTMENT BEFORE REFERMCE LIST
- 6- ALL RECOMMENDED REVIEWERS, WE NEED EXPERT OUTSIDE YOUR COUNTRY WITH THEIR FORMAL E-MAIL. YAHOO AND GMAIL ARE NOT ACCEPTE
- 7- THE FINAL PAPER AFTER ACCEPTED scientifically MUST BE ENGLISH EDITED BY SPECIALIZED ENGLISH OFFICE AND SENDING US CERTIFACT or will be rejected

Second rejection

Subject: Decision on your submission to Discover Cities

Date: Wed, 02 Oct 2024 18:35:04 +0000

From: Empowering Urban Energy Landscapes: Advancing Sustainability and Resilience
<discovercities@springernature.com>

To: fivos@itia.ntua.gr

Ref: Submission ID 16ecb824-f42a-4fc6-a2ad-077390689562

Dear Dr Sargentis,

Your manuscript "A review of the energy policy in Greece in the last 50 years and its implications to prosperity" has now been assessed. If there are any reviewer comments on your manuscript, you can find them at the end of this email.

Regrettably, your manuscript has been rejected for publication in Discover Cities.

Editor: Prof Claudia Fabiani

Both reviewers have thoroughly evaluated the submission and unanimously recommended rejection. After conducting a subsequent analysis and carefully considering their feedback, I also concur that the work, in its current form, cannot be accepted for publication.

Thank you for the opportunity to review your work. I'm sorry that we cannot be more positive on this occasion and hope you will not be deterred from submitting future work to Discover Cities.

Kind regards,

Claudia Fabiani
Editor
Discover Cities

While I'm sorry we cannot publish your work in Discover Cities, your manuscript may be a good fit for one of our other journals. At Springer Nature we provide a free service to give authors a range of personalised journal recommendations. The corresponding author will receive an email with more information in the next 2 days.

Reviewer Comments:

Reviewer 1

Attachments:

- <https://reviewer-feedback.springernature.com/download/attachment/6bd815df-9b3d-4935-9a17-82c0c46a7bf5>

Content of the attachment
The authors aim to relate the effect of energy prices on the prosperity of the country they are analysing(Greece), where “prosperity” is defined as GDP. Starting with this premises, it sounds like they want to perform a welfare analysis, but all the theory related to the topic is missing.
The overall work lacks coherence and scientific rigor. Three elements are collected (energy prices, policies for energy transition, and welfare), and a series of considerations are listed based on correlations between data series that are notoriously very closely related (energy prices and consumption, GDP). The cited literature in support is insufficient and is very outdated in terms of the economic area, which has been dealing with much more complex welfare evaluations for years than what is presented.
The interpretation of the data is biased and does not support the conclusions.
My opinion regarding the manuscript is to reject it, and I do not believe there are grounds for revision and future resubmission because the scientific quality and the tools used are far from sufficient quality.

Reviewer 2

The reviewed paper provides an overview of energy policy developments over the past 50 years in Greece, with a focus on the transition towards renewable energy and its impact on economic prosperity. While this is a timely and relevant topic, the paper falls short in several key areas, leading to a lack of clarity and depth in its analysis. I recommend the rejection of this paper for the following reasons:

- 1) Unclear Definition of "Electricity Price": The term "electricity price" is used throughout the paper without clarification and it is not clear out of the context what they mean by it. It is essential to define whether the authors are referring to the price paid by consumers, which includes energy costs, grid fees, taxes, and subsidies, or just the spot-market price. This ambiguity undermines the paper's credibility, as electricity pricing is complex and varies depending on the perspective taken.
- 2) Incomplete Discussion of Subsidies: The paper argues that subsidies for wind and solar energy (WESA) result in higher electricity prices and that coal-based electricity production is cheaper. However, this analysis does not state if coal itself is subsidised as well, which is a crucial factor in comparing the true costs of different energy sources. For example, the 2022 Report on Energy Subsidies in the EU indicates that Greece spends around 1% of its GDP on fossil fuel subsidies—similar to the amount spent on renewable energy subsidies. This omission significantly weakens the argument regarding the cost-competitiveness of coal versus renewables. The authors should acknowledge these broader subsidy dynamics to provide a more balanced analysis [<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52022DC0642>].
- 3) Overlooking EU Energy Efficiency Directive: The authors discuss the correlation between economic prosperity and electricity consumption, correctly noting that economic downturns in Greece led to lower energy demand. However, they fail to mention the 2012 EU Energy Efficiency Directive, which may have also contributed to reduced consumption since 2012. Ignoring this regulatory development limits the comprehensiveness of their analysis on the factors influencing electricity demand.

4) Unexplained Elements in Figures: Figures 6 and 7 include a blue dashed line that lacks any explanation, leaving readers to guess its significance. Providing clear legends and descriptions is essential for the interpretability of data visualizations.

5) Unclear Policy Effects: The authors claim that policies implemented after the start of the war in Ukraine have led to higher electricity prices in Greece and the EU. However, the link between these policies and rising prices is unclear. The market clearing price is determined by the merit-order system, and since the EU heavily relies on electricity generated from gas-fired power plants, it is the increase in gas prices, rather than the policies themselves, that has contributed to the rise in electricity costs.

6) Weak Explanation of WASES Impact on Prices: In Figure 7, the authors present data suggesting that increased electricity generation from WASES leads to higher prices, yet no explanation is provided for this counterintuitive finding. Wind and solar energy have low marginal costs, which should typically result in lower spot-market prices. The lack of discussion about potential factors, such as the increased need for balancing energy, leaves a major gap in understanding this relationship. Moreover, it remains unclear whether the authors are discussing spot-market prices or consumer prices, which further complicates the analysis.

8) Ambiguity in Language: In line 37, the authors refer to a "shift," but no prior explanation of this shift is given. Such vague language detracts from the overall clarity of the paper and leaves readers confused about the arguments being presented.

In summary, while the topic of the paper is interesting, its shortcomings in clarity, key omissions, and insufficient analysis prevent it from making a meaningful contribution to the field. For this reason, I recommend rejection in its current form.