

Working Paper Series

#2009-064

A structural nonparametric reappraisal of the CO₂ emissions-income relationship

Théophile T. Azomahou, Micheline Goedhuys and Phu Nguyen-Van

A structural nonparametric reappraisal of the CO₂ emissions-income relationship

Théophile T. Azomahou^a*, Micheline Goedhuys^a, Phu Nguyen-Van^b

^a UNU-MERIT, Maastricht University Keizer Karelplein 19, 6211 TC Maastricht, the Netherlands

^b BETA-CNRS, Université de Strasbourg
 61 avenue de la Forêt Noire, F-67085 Strasbourg Cedex, France

December, 2009

Abstract

Relying on a structural nonparametric estimation, we show that CO_2 emissions clearly increase with income at low income levels. For higher income levels, we observe a decreasing relationship, though not significant. We also find that CO_2 emissions monotonically increases with energy use at a decreasing rate.

Keywords: Nonparametric triangular systems, EKC; Energy use; CO₂ emissions

JEL Classification: C14; O13

UNU-MERIT Working Papers ISSN 1871-9872

Maastricht Economic and social Research and training centre on Innovation and Technology, UNU-MERIT

UNU-MERIT Working Papers intend to disseminate preliminary results of research carried out at the Centre to stimulate discussion on the issues raised.

^{*}Correspondence: Azomahou T., Tel. +31 433884440, Fax +31 433884499, e-mail: azomahou@merit.unu.edu; M. Goedhuys (micheline.goedhuys@skynet.be), P. Nguyen-Van (nguyen-van@unistra.fr)

1 Introduction

The concept of the Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC), introduced by Grossman and Krueger (1995), is a hypothesized relationship among various indicators of environmental degradation and income per capita. In its basic specification, it assumes that during the early stages of economic development, environmental damage and pollution increase. Beyond some level of income per capita, also termed turning point, the trend reverses and economic development leads to environmental quality improvement.

While the inverted U-shape of the EKC has been confirmed for several environmental quality indicators (see Azomahou et al., 2006, for a literature review), for CO₂ emissions a lot of controversy remains. Indeed, the majority of studies mainly based on reduced-form single-equation models find emissions to monotonically increase with income. These models however do not account for possible feedback effects of the environment to economic growth, or for the fact that the economy and the environment are jointly determined, as explained by Perrings (1987). Omission to account for feedback effects may lead to simultaneity bias and inconsistent estimates (Stern et al. 1996). As far as we know, Liu (2005) provided the first study of the relationship between CO₂ emissions and income based on a parametric two-equations system. The author underlined the crucial role of energy use in the system and concludes on a negative relationship between CO₂ emissions and income. However, given the sample used by Liu (2005) – 24 OECD countries over the period 1975-1990 – this result may not be representative to conclude on the existence of a CO₂ emissions-EKC.

In this study, we propose a structural nonparametric estimation of the emissions-EKC, relying on the nonparametric triangular system of Newey et al. (1999). By using a structural model, we improve the specification to account for simultaneity between income and emissions. In addition, by relying on a nonparametric framework we allow for non-linearities of unknown form in the income-environment relationship. It is worth noticing that the nonparametric methodology has been applied to reduced form EKC models (Millimet et al., 2003; Bertinelli and Strobl, 2005; Azomahou et al., 2006; Nguyen Van, 2009) showing indeed important non-linearities. However, to the best of our knowledge, our study is the first to analyse the CO₂ emissions-EKC in a structural nonparametric specification.

We apply this methodology to panel data of 107 countries, both low and high income countries, over a 44 year period (1961-2004), thus having an excellent coverage in time and income dispersion. Although our results are not supportive for the existence of an EKC for CO₂ emissions, we find that CO₂ emissions firstly increase with income at low income levels and then become delinked with income at high income levels. We also find that CO₂ emissions monotonically increases with energy use at a decreasing rate.

2 Structural nonparametric specification

We consider the triangular nonparametric simultaneous specification of Newey et al. (1999):

$$y = m(x, z_0) + \varepsilon \tag{1}$$

$$x = \pi(\mathbf{z}) + u, \quad \mathbb{E}(\varepsilon | u, \mathbf{z}) = \mathbb{E}(\varepsilon | u) \neq 0, \quad \mathbb{E}(u | \mathbf{z}) = 0$$
 (2)

where y, x and z_0 denote respectively CO₂ emissions per capita, GDP per capita and energy use per capita; \mathbf{z} is a set of instruments that includes z_0 . The system (1)-(2) is a generalization of the limited information simultaneous equations model to allow for structural nonparametric relation $m(x, z_0)$ between variables y, x and z_0 , and a nonparametric reduced form $\pi(\mathbf{z})$. The conditional expectation of equation (1) yields the integral equation:

$$\mathbb{E}(y|\mathbf{z}) \equiv \pi(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbb{E}[m(x, z_0)|\mathbf{z}] = \int m(x, z_0) F(dx|\mathbf{z})$$
(3)

where F denotes the conditional cumulative distribution function of x given \mathbf{z} . Thus, functions π and F are the nonparametric generalization of the reduced forms for y and x. Newey et al. (1999) discussed the identification of the system (1)-(2). Starting from a preliminary estimation of the reduced forms $\hat{\pi}$ and \hat{F} :

$$\hat{\pi}(\mathbf{z}) = \int m(x, z_0) \hat{F}(dx|\mathbf{z}),\tag{4}$$

the authors developed an estimator for \hat{m} that overcomes the well known ill-posed problem.² In order to apply this methodology to analyze the EKC, we specify a generalized additive model (hereafter GAM) for fixed effects panel data.³ For equation (1), the GAM is

$$y_{it} = \sum_{j=1}^{p} m_j(w_{it}^j) + \mu_i + \varepsilon_{it}, \qquad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad t = 1, \dots, T$$
 (5)

where w_{it}^j is the jth component $(j = 1, \dots, p)$ of $\mathbf{w}_{it} \equiv (x_{it}, z_{0it})$. For equation (2) we use a semiparametric GAM specification the structure of which is given by

$$x_{it} = \sum_{k=1}^{q} \pi_j \left(z_{1it}^k \right) + \mathbf{z}'_{2it} \gamma + \lambda_i + u_{it}, \qquad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad t = 1, \dots, T$$

$$(6)$$

where z_{1it}^k s is the kth component $(k = 1, \dots, q)$ of the set of continuous instruments \mathbf{z}_1 and \mathbf{z}_{2it} corresponds to other instruments which do enter linearly in the specification. The unobserved fixed effects μ_i and λ_i can be eliminated by first differences:

$$y_{it} - y_{i,t-1} = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \left[m_j(w_{it}^j) - m_j(w_{i,t-1}^j) \right] + \varepsilon_{it} - \varepsilon_{i,t-1}$$
 (7)

$$x_{it} - x_{i,t-1} = \sum_{k=1}^{q} \left[\pi_j \left(z_{1it}^k \right) - \pi_j \left(z_{1i,t-1}^k \right) \right] + (\mathbf{z}_{2it} - \mathbf{z}_{2i,t-1})' \gamma + u_{it} - u_{i,t-1}$$
 (8)

Observe that the method of Newey et al. (1999) consists of estimating equation (7) by including an additional control variable which is the first difference residuals $\hat{u}_{it} - \hat{u}_{i,t-1}$ computed from equation (8). Therefore, estimation of equation (7) involves in total five univariate unknown functions associated to x_{it} , $x_{i,t-1}$, z_{0it} , $z_{0i,t-1}$, and $\hat{u}_{it} - \hat{u}_{i,t-1}$. We perform estimation in two steps: (i) we construct semiparametric first differences residuals $\hat{u}_{it} - \hat{u}_{i,t-1}$ of equation (8) where the parametric estimates $\hat{\gamma}$ are obtained using the Robinson's (1988) procedure. (ii) We estimate

¹Identification is needed as π and F are functionals of the distribution of observables (y, x, \mathbf{z}) .

²The ill-posed inverse problem follows from non-continuity of \hat{m} . Indeed, lack of continuity of $\hat{\pi}$ and \hat{F} can translate into large inaccuracies in \hat{m} .

³See, e.g., Hastie and Tibshirani (1990) for further details on GAM.

the nonparametric model in equation (7) using the residuals $\hat{u}_{it} - \hat{u}_{i,t-1}$ from (i) as additional regressor. In practice, we base our nonparametric estimation on the 'backfitting algorithm' (Hastie and Tibshirani, 1990). Furthermore, as m_j is estimated twice, denoted as $\hat{m}_j^{(1)}$ and $\hat{m}_j^{(2)}$ for w_{it}^j and $w_{i,t-1}^j$ respectively, a simple and more precise estimator of m_j can be obtained by a weighted average: $\hat{m}_j = (\hat{m}_j^{(1)} + \hat{m}_j^{(2)})/2$.

3 Data and estimation results

3.1 Data

The data used for the analysis consist of an unbalanced panel of 107 countries, both developed and developing countries and spanning the period 1961-2004. The data are obtained from the World Development Indicators database 2007. For equation (6), GDP per capita, measured in constant 2000 US dollars, is used as dependent variable. The variables included in \mathbf{z}_1 are primary energy use per capita (in kilotons of oil equivalent), foreign direct investment (net inflows), population density, trade openness (imports plus exports divided by GDP). Variables included in \mathbf{z}_2 are regional dummies (East Asia & Pacific, Europe & Central Asia used as reference, Latin America & Caribbean, Middle East & North Africa, North America, South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa) and year dummies, to control for autonomous technological change and macroeconomic effects. For equation (5), we use CO₂ emissions per capita (in metric tons) as dependent variable. Similar to Liu (2005), the regressors included in equation (5) are GDP per capita and primary energy use per capita. Statistics in Table 1 (for 1961, 1982, 2004 and for the whole sample) show that on average, GDP and CO₂ emissions increase over time while energy use remains stable.

Insert Table 1 here

3.2 Estimation results

Estimation results are presented in Figure 1 and Table 2. The curves displayed in Figure 1 correspond to the structural nonparametric functions discussed in the previous section. We use the 'gain' statistic (see Hastie and Tibshirani, 1990, for further details) to test the significance of non-linearity in the econometric specification. Table 2 summarizes the 'gain' statistics. As can be checked from the p-values, all the parametric functions are strongly rejected in favor of the nonparametric counterparts, meaning that our nonparametric specification provides a better approximation of the data.

Insert Table 2 here

From Figure 1(a) we observe a positive and significant effect of income on CO_2 emissions for low income levels. The turning point is located near 16500 USD per capita GDP, beyond

⁴We do not report the results of the reduced-form estimation, since the control variables in equation (8) are only used for the sake of instruments. The results are available from the authors upon request. Moreover, in estimations all the nonparametric functions are normalized to have zero means.

⁵The 'gain' is the difference in normalized deviance between the GAM and the parametric linear models. Its distribution is approximated by a χ^2 ($df = df_g - df_l$), where df_g denotes the degree of freedom of the GAM and df_l is the degree of freedom of the analogue parametric linear model.

this point the relationship turns negative.⁶ Nevertheless, this decreasing part is not significant. The proportion of observations located beyond the turning point is about 10%.⁷ Compared to Liu (2005) who found a downward slope in a panel of 24 OECD countries over the period 1975-1990, we equally observe such a trend for high income levels implying that the negative effect of income on CO_2 emissions is at least neutralized.

Insert Figure 1 here

In Figure 1(b), we plot the estimated curve for CO_2 emissions and energy use. As outlined by Liu (2005), the latter can be viewed as a proxy to account for differences in industrial structure across nations which may explain their ability to reduce emissions. This relationship is monotonically increasing with a concave pattern, meaning that CO_2 emissions increase with energy use but at a decreasing rate. We can interpret this finding as the presence of a learning effect, a technological improvement, and/or changes in energy composition (shifts from fossil energies, which are sources of CO_2 emissions, to non-fossil energies) that allow for limiting CO_2 emissions when using energy. It seems that more energy intensive economies are more likely to implement cleaner technologies and stringent environmental policies which in turn might neutralize the positive effect of income on CO_2 emissions.

4 Conclusion

We show that CO₂ emissions clearly increase with income at low income levels. For higher income levels, we observe a non significant decreasing slope. This finding reconciles previous results based on different specifications and partial data. Moreover, CO₂ emissions rise with energy use but at a decreasing rate. These results show that for a given industrial structure of the economy, higher income countries are likely to achieve the delinking of CO₂ emissions from income.

References

- Azomahou, T., Laisney, F. and P. Nguyen Van, P., 2006. Economic development and CO₂ emissions: A nonparametric panel approach, Journal of Public Economics 90, 1347-1363.
- Bertinelli, L. and E. Strobl, 2005. The environmental Kuznets curve semi-parametrically revisited, Economics Letters 88, 350-357.
- Grossman, G.M. and A.B. Krueger, 1995. Economic growth and the environment, The Quarterly Journal of Economics 60, 353-377.
- Hastie, T.J. and R.J. Tibshirani, 1990. Generalized Additive Models, Chapman and Hall, London, New York.
- Liu, X. 2005. Explaining the relationship between CO₂ emissions and national income-The role of energy consumption, Economics Letters 87, 325-328.

⁶The exact value of the turning point is computed at 16457.47 USD per capita GDP.

⁷The corresponding countries are Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Israel, Kuwait, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland.

- Millimet, D.L., J.A. List and T. Stengos, 2003. The environmental Kuznets curve: Real progress or misspecified models? Review of Economics and Statistics 85, 1038-1047.
- Newey, W.K., J.P., Powell and F. Vella, 1999. Nonparametric estimation of triangular simultaneous equations models, Econometrica 67, 565-603.
- Nguyen-Van P., 2009. Energy consumption and income: A semiparametric panel data analysis, Energy Economics, forthcoming.
- Perrings, C., 1987. Economy and environment: A theoretical Essay on the interdependence of economic and environmental systems. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, P.M., 1988. Root-N-consistent semiparametric regression. Econometrica 56, 931-954.
- Stern, D.I., M.S., Common and E.B. Barbier, 1996. Economic growth and environmental degradation: The environmental Kuznets curve and sustainable Development, World Development 24, 1151-1160.

	ũ	מ
•	Ē	٦
	71	_
•	ř	4
-	+	2
	٥	Ş
-	ţ	_
	•	_
	Q	٥
	777	2
•	Ξ	7
	7	5
	_	-
	1200	4
	Ç	۲
	ď	3
,	۲	′
Ĺ	_	4
_	•	3
٦		'
	a	ر
-	7	2
-	'n	-
L	"	_
ŀ	0	_

		GDP per capita	: capita		00	2 emissi	CO ₂ emissions per capita	apita	Ene	rgy use]	Energy use per capita	
	mean	std.	min.	max.	mean		std. min. max.	max.	mean	std.	min.	max.
1961	2996.034	2996.034 4020.431	77.662	19959.91	2.404	4.726	0.008	36.319	0.00243	0.0021	0.0003	0.01
1982	5163.583	7156.795	124.515	39368.63	4.701	9.238	0.027	90.425	0.00239	0.0034	0.0001	0.023
2004	6678.001	6678.001 9977.794	86.45	49996.1	5.424	5.424 8.05	0.013	69.159	0.00237	0.003	0.0002	0.02
pooled	pooled 5258.663 7722.851	7722.851	56.468	56.468 59182.83	4.927	11.02	4.927 11.02 0.0005 183.836	183.836	0.00238 0.003 0.0001 0.036	0.003	0.0001	0.036

Table 2: Gain statistics test

$\overline{\text{Form}^{(a)}}$	Gain value	Degree of freedom	<i>p</i> -value
$\hat{m}_1(x_{it})$	2.518	4.486	0.007
$\hat{m}_1(x_{i,t-1})$	4.311	6.972	0.000
$\hat{m}_2(z_{0it})$	50.863	7.979	0.000
$\hat{m}_2(z_{0i,t-1})$	49.628	4.665	0.000
$\hat{m}_3(\hat{u}_{it} - \hat{u}_{i,t-1})$	2.617	4.996	0.005

 $^{^{(}a)}$: x is GDP, z_0 is energy use, and u is the residuals of equation (4).




Figure 1: Structural nonparametric estimations. [left (a)]: $\rm CO_2$ emissions – income relationship. [right (b)]: $\rm CO_2$ emissions – energy use relationship. The solid line represents the nonparametric fit. The dashed lines correspond to the 95% pointwise confidence interval.

The UNU-MERIT WORKING Paper Series

- 2009-01 Effectiveness of R&D Tax Incentives in Small and Large Enterprises in Québec by Rufin Baghana and Pierre Mohnen
- 2009-02 Bridges in social capital: A review of the definitions and the social capital of social capital researchers by Semih Akçomak
- 2009-03 The Role of Firms in Energy Transformation by Radhika Perrot
- 2009-04 Standards as a platform for innovation and learning in the global economy: a case study of Chilean salmon farming industry
- 2009-05 Consumer behaviour: evolution of preferences and the search for novelty by M. Abraham Garcia-Torres
- 2009-06 The role of consumption and the financing of health investment under epidemic shocks by Théophile T. Azomahou, Bity Diene and Luc Soete
- 2009-07 Remittances, lagged dependent variables and migration stocks as determinants of migration from developing countries by Thomas H.W. Ziesemer
- 2009-08 Thinking locally: Exploring the importance of a subsidiary-centered model of FDIrelated spillovers in Brazil by Anabel Marin and Ionara Costa
- 2009-09 Are International Market Demands Compatible with Serving Domestic Social Needs? Challenges in Strengthening Innovation Capacity in Kenya's Horticulture Industry by Mirjam Steglich, Ekin Keskin, Andy Hall and Jeroen Dijkman
- 2009-10 Industrialisation as an engine of growth in developing countries by Adam Szirmai
- 2009-11 The motivations, organisation and outcomes of university-industry interaction in the Netherlands by Isabel Maria Bodas Freitas and Bart Verspagen
- 2009-12 Habit Formation, Demand and Growth through product innovation by M. Abraham Garcia-Torres
- 2009-13 The Diffusion of Informal Knowledge and Innovation Performance: A sectoral approach by M. Abraham Garcia-Torres and Hugo Hollanders
- 2009-14 What does it take for an R&D tax incentive policy to be effective? by Pierre Mohnen and Boris Lokshin
- 2009-15 Knowledge Base Determinants of Technology Sourcing in the Clean Development Mechanism Projects by Asel Doranova, Ionara Costa and Geert Duysters
- 2009-16 Stochastic environmental effects, demographic variation, and economic growth by Théophile T. Azomahou and Tapas Mishra
- 2009-17 Measuring eco-innovation by Anthony Arundel and René Kemp
- 2009-18 Learning How to Consume and Returns to Product Promotion by Zakaria Babutsidze
- 2009-19 Strengthening Agricultural Innovation Capacity: Are Innovation Brokers the Answer? by Laurens Klerkx, Andy Hall and Cees Leeuwis
- 2009-20 Collinearity in growth regressions: The example of worker remittances by Thomas H.W. Ziesemer
- 2009-21 Foreign Direct Investment in Times of Global Economic Crisis by Sergey Filippov and Kálmán Kalotay
- 2009-22 Network-independent partner selection and the evolution of innovation networks by Joel Baum, Robin Cowan and Nicolas Jonard
- 2009-23 Multinational enterprises, development and globalisation: Some clarifications and a research agenda by Rajneesh Narula and John H. Dunning
- 2009-24 Why Rural Rich Remain Energy Poor by Bilal Mirza and René Kemp
- 2009-25 Compliance with the private standards and capacity building of national institutions under globalization: new agendas for developing countries? by Michiko Iizuka and Yari Borbon-Galvez
- 2009-26 The Impact of the Credit Crisis on Poor Developing Countries: Growth, worker remittances, accumulation and migration by Thomas H.W. Ziesemer

- 2009-27 Designing plans for organizational development, lessons from three large-scale SMEinitiatives by Tinne Lommelen, Friso den Hertog, Lien Beck and Raf Sluismans
- 2009-28 Growth with imported resources: On the sustainability of U.S. growth and foreign debt by Thomas H.W. Ziesemer
- 2009-29 Innovative Sales, R&D and Total Innovation Expenditures: Panel Evidence on their Dynamics by Wladimir Raymond, Pierre Mohnen, Franz Palm and Sybrand Schim van der Loeff
- 2009-30 Malthus' Revenge by Luc Soete
- 2009-31 Preparing for the Next, Very Long Crisis: Towards a 'Cool' Science and Technology Policy Agenda For a Globally Warming Economy by Paul A. David
- 2009-32 Innovation and Economic Development by Jan Fagerberg, Martin Srholec and Bart Verspagen
- 2009-33 Attracting and embedding R&D by multinational firms: policy recommendations for EU new member states by Rajneesh Narula
- 2009-34 Student Network Centrality and Academic Performance: Evidence from United Nations University by Ying Zhang, Iman Rajabzadeh and Rodolfo Lauterbach
- 2009-35 Reverse knowledge transfer and its implications for European policy by Rajneesh Narula and Julie Michel
- 2009-36 Innovation for the base of the pyramid: Critical perspectives from development studies on heterogeneity and participation by Saurabh Arora and Henny Romijn
- 2009-37 Caste as Community? Networks of social affinity in a South Indian village by Saurabh Arora and Bulat Sanditov
- 2009-38 How productive are academic researchers in agriculture-related sciences? The Mexican case by René Rivera, José Luis Sampedro, Gabriela Dutrénit, Javier Mario Ekboir and Alexandre O. Vera-Cruz
- 2009-39 Alliance-based Network View on Chinese Firms' Catching-up: Case Study of Huawei Technologies Co.Ltd. by Ying Zhang
- 2009-40 Innovation dynamics in Tuberculosis control in India: The shift to new partnerships by Nora Engel
- 2009-41 Internationalization of Chinese firms in Europe by Ying Zhang and Sergey Filippov
- 2009-42 Fits and Misfits: Technological Matching and R&D Networks by Robin Cowan, Nicolas Jonard and Bulat Sanditov
- 2009-43 Explaining the lack of dynamics in the diffusion of small stationary fuel cells by Bert Droste-Franke, Jörg Krüger, Stephan Lingner and Thomas H.W. Ziesemer
- 2009-44 FDI, R&D and Innovation Output in the Chinese Automobile Industry by Chen Fang and Pierre Mohnen
- 2009-45 Inertia, Interaction and Clustering in Demand by Zakaria Babutsidze and Robin Cowan
- 2009-46 What Do Complex Adaptive Systems Look Like and What Are the Implications for Innovation Policy? by Andy Hall and Norman Clark
- 2009-47 Environmental innovation: Using qualitative models to identify indicators for policy by Minna Kanerva, Anthony Arundel and René Kemp
- 2009-48 Firm Ownership, FOEs, and POEs by Alice H. Amsden
- 2009-49 Types of Entrepreneurship and Economic Growth by Erik Stam and André van Stel
- 2009-50 Innovation Policy, Entrepreneurship, and Development: A Finnish View by Otto Toivanen
- 2009-51 The Growth of Knowledge-intensive Entrepreneurship in India, 1991-2007 by Sunil Mani
- 2009-52 Technological Innovation, Entrepreneurship and Development by David B. Audretsch and Mark Sanders
- 2009-53 Innovation and Microenterprises Growth in Ethiopia by Mulu Gebreeyesus

- 2009-54 Incubators as Tools for Entrepreneurship Promotion in Developing Countries by I. Semih Akçomak
- 2009-55 Is that Innovation? Assessing Examples of Revitalized Economic Dynamics among Clusters of Small Producers in Northern Vietnam by Jaap Voeten, Job de Haan and Gerard de Groot
- 2009-56 R&D Behaviour and the Emergence of Fat-tailed Firm Size Distributions by Zakaria Babutsidze
- 2009-57 From Quantity to Quality: Challenges for Investment Promotion Agencies by Sergey Filippov and José Guimón
- 2009-58 Tacit Knowledge and Innovation Capacity: Evidence from the Indian Livestock Sector by Rasheed Sulaiman V., Laxmi Thummuru, Andy Hall and Jeroen Dijkman
- 2009-59 Technology frontier, labor productivity and economic growth: Evidence from OECD countries by Théophile T. Azomahou, Bity Diene and Mbaye Diene
- 2009-60 A Different Look at Inward FDI into Mainland China by Ying Zhang
- 2009-61 Inactions and Spikes of Investment in Ethiopian Manufacturing Firms: Empirical Evidence on Irreversibility and Non-convexities by Mulu Gebreeyesus
- 2009-62 Systems of Innovation by Luc Soete, Bart Verspagen and Bas ter Weel
- 2009-63 Assessing risk discourses: Nano S&T in the Global South by Minna Kanerva
- 2009-64 *A structural nonparametric reappraisal of the CO₂ emissions-income relationship* by Théophile T. Azomahou, Micheline Goedhuys and Phu Nguyen-Van