

RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

ROUND 1

Reviewer #1

- “The Authors provide a detailed analysis of the evolution of the UK's renewable energy support policy. While the overall work is interesting, it is not clear where the "secondary empirical data" (as mentioned in Section 3.3) were used, as the analysis seems to be based solely on qualitative and historical assessments and reviews of previous literature.”

The secondary empirical data is used under the Agenda Setting. Since it is secondary, it is sought from existing documents and literatures. The data on the cost of electricity (Pollitt, 2010) under the Agenda Setting is an example.

To emphasize the empirical input more, the revised paper now has more empirical evidence under the discussion section. Examples include data on contract for difference and capacity market auction result and percentage increase of renewable energy required under quota obligation (QO). Since qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods could be used in analysing empirical data (Creswell, 2015; Spenser 2015), I have employed the qualitative approach.

I have also identified the historical analysis as well as other methods employed under the Methodology and Data section.

- “I feel that the research could benefit from a more rigorous argumentation (perhaps a comparative analysis of hybrid versus traditional policies or an impact assessment for CFD & CM) based on some form of empirical analysis.”
Many thanks for the idea. The revised paper now provides for a section entitled “Traditional Policies versus Hybrid Policies.” Under this section, the essential features of feed-in tariff (FIT), QO, and contract for difference and capacity market (CFD & CM) are outlined, compared and evaluated. I choose to do a comparative analysis rather than an impact assessment because there is insufficient information to fairly assess the performance of the CFD & CM at the moment, being a new policy. Only its design and preliminary operation could be evaluated as I have done.

- “1. In the Abstract, the approach/method is not immediately clear. Perhaps this could be emphasized. In addition, the original contribution/added value of the article should be pointed out.”

The revised abstract now states the method clearly. The research employs qualitative methods. In the methodology and data section of the revised paper, I have identified specific qualitative methods such as case study, the systematic review of specific bodies of literature, the policy cycle developed from the stage theory, and historical analysis.

The first line of the abstract also states the original contribution as the contextualization and conceptualization of the hybrid renewable energy support policy. I have reviewed the literature and have not found any other scholarly work that has framed the CFD & CM system as a hybrid policy.

- “2. The Highlights seem to reflect research goals. These should be phrased more as a summary of the work ("convey the core findings of the article" as stated in the Guide for Authors).”

The revised highlights now convey the core findings of the article.

- “3. On page 3, line 17, ‘under the RE’ should probably be ‘under the FIT’ in both cases.”

This has been corrected.

- “4. In the first part of Section 2, several abbreviations are introduced, although not all of them have been defined at first use (some have been defined only in the Abstract and some not at all). This issue should be resolved throughout the manuscript.”

I have now defined the abbreviations at first use by stating the terms in full and providing the acronyms in parentheses.

- “5. On page 10, the sentence on line 42 may require some rephrasing. "These two categories require a closer investigation" suggests that there will be a more detailed discussion of just the ‘environmental protection ambitions’ and the ‘energy sustainability concerns’, when in fact the entire ‘Agenda setting’ process is described.”

I have removed this sentence as I have now rewritten the section.

- “6. On page 14, line 35, "they would qualify for incentives" should probably be ‘they would qualify for incentives’.”

This has been corrected.

- “7. On page 24, in the beginning of section 4.2, the CFD & CM mechanisms should be described in more detail (perhaps by comparison/contrast to the FIT and QS), as they constitute the focus of the research.”

The two mechanisms employed by the CFD & CM policy are now discussed under the discussion section. I differentiate the mechanisms and show their current operation under the policy.

- “8. The Figure/Annex is not specifically referred to in the manuscript. It should be mentioned in Section 2.”

The figure is the last thing stated under the subsection entitled “The Policy Cycle” in the Methodology section. You will find this mentioned as the last thing in the subsection entitled “The Policy Cycle” under the Methodology and Data section of the revised version.

Reviewer #2

- “In the paper 'Hybrid renewable energy support policy in the power sector' the author has discussed very important aspects of renewable energy policy planning and implementation. The author illustrates the need and implications for a hybrid renewable energy support policy by analysing the quota and market based system in the UK renewable energy sector. It is interesting to see the use of the hybrid in a non-technological perspective which is a novel idea. UK Government has implemented number of programmes to adhere to national as well as regional (EU) renewable energy targets and ratified international climate change policies, however, adoption of renewable energy has not been reinforced and maintained by policy support mechanisms. This paper has presented some interesting ideas regarding a broad analysis of the circumstances and processes underpinning the choice of support policies; however, the author can improve the paper by addressing some of the following points:”

Many thanks for the elucidation

- “1. A lot of information has been provided of the historical policy analysis of renewable energy programmes in the UK without a critical perspective of how these programmes have not had the desired inroads into the renewable energy sector - reference of other academic paper will be beneficial in this. Critical analysis of previous academic research can provide a context to the policy analysis.”

The purpose of the Agenda Setting is to provide a context for the policy analysis (customary of the policy cycle method). As such, I focus on the problems of previous policies under the subsections of the Agenda Setting entitled “The emphasis on renewable energy” and “The electricity market reform.”

I have now articulated these problems better in the revised paper under the Agenda Setting subsection entitled “Policy Response: The Renewable Energy Mandate in the Low Carbon Agenda.” I have discussed the Non-Fossil Fuel Obligation (NFFO) and the renewables obligation (RO) which are the regimes that applied on a large scale. To avoid repetition, I did not discuss the feed-in tariff (FIT) at this point since this would still form part of my discussion under the section on traditional policies versus hybrid policies. I have cited more literature, and have critiqued them in the last paragraph of the subsection.

A more general and critical discussion on the problems of FIT and QS, as the most contested systems, with examples from the UK and other jurisdictions can be found under the subsection of the revised paper entitled “Traditional Policies versus Hybrid Policies” in the discussion section. I have cited more academic papers on these as well.

- “2. The paper needs more academic references along with the policy documents mentioned. How can this historical link be established - author could use some academic paper and/or government reports.”

Each phase of the policy cycle now starts with an introductory paragraph that shows the connection to the policy development. I have also cited more academic papers to support the government documents. There are more sources on the Agenda Setting and Formulation because these have advanced over the years. I only give an overview of the Decision Making and Implementation stages because these are in progress (relevant regulations are still being made, auctions have recently begun).

Note that not many papers have traced the historical link since the policy is relatively new. Many of the existing research, which I have reviewed, have focused on the NFFO and the RO regimes, only providing insights into the CFD & CM rather than discussing it as a complete policy. As such, one of the major contributions of this article is to update the CFD & CM trajectory through a policy cycle showing its iterative nature.

- “3. There are too many abbreviations and concepts that are being discussed but not explained to the reader in the first instance. Too many abbreviations have been used in the paper without mentioning the full form. Either a list can be provided to the reader at the beginning of the paper, or within the text full forms can be mentioned.”

I have now defined the abbreviations when first mentioned by stating the full forms and providing the acronyms in parentheses.

- “4. Section 4 (Results and Discussion) brings together the different themes and analysed threads of the research. However, it needs to be revised and rewritten. There are too many sub sections and topics. It needs to reflect a more in-depth understanding of the renewable energy policy instead of just listing out the historical background. So sub-sections of 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.4 are still providing policy trajectories (so not really the analysis). Section 4.2 delves into the hybrid policy support systems from the point of view of lessons learnt from the UK (4.2.1) and globally (4.2.2) would benefit more from a focused expansion of information and contribution of the paper. The author could include other academic articles that have suggested

enhanced policy mechanisms to support renewable energy strategies (these papers might not refer to these policy support systems as 'hybrid')”

The result and discussion section has now been rewritten. I have separated the result from the discussion in the revised paper to make the structure clearer. The result section now describes the policy trajectory. It also provides for substantial analysis. However, since the policy cycle is a descriptive tool (see Hupe and Hill, 2006; Smith and Larimer, 2009), this section limits analysis so as to make the description more objective. Also, the standard is to present results objectively, without subjectivity.

The bulk of the analysis is now done in the discussion section. The section analyses the contract for difference and the capacity market as two different mechanisms, shows how both of them work together as a single hybrid policy, compares traditional policy and hybrid policy, and expands the information on and the analysis of the UK and the global lessons. It also differentiates the form of hybrid policy already in existence, as discussed by scholars and practiced by jurisdictions (policy combinations), from the form represented by the CFD & CM model (compact hybrids). Preexisting hybrid policy examples mostly combine support mechanisms under different legal instruments and frameworks, but the CFD & CM combines two support mechanisms under a single legal instrument and framework.

I have now cited several examples as well as academic papers. Some of these are also critiqued.

- “5. The paper provides a good law/regulation perspective to the RE and QO in the UK; it would be good to give a comparative analysis by adding a few lines about the US or other country context. Role of the national, international and region regulations is important here - European Commission sets thresholds and deadlines for all member countries. Specifically section 4.2.2. global lessons more academic work has to be referenced.”

The revised paper now emphasises the role of the EU in the development of the CFD & CM policy. It states all the relevant directives of the EU and how they have contributed to the development of the policy. It also contrasts the legal stature of the EU directives with the persuasive status of international non-human rights regimes at the domestic level. It shows how both regional and international legal regimes influence the national policy.

The revised paper illustrates RE policies of other jurisdictions, focusing on those that appear to be hybrids. It cites specific examples under the sections on hybrid versus traditional policies and global lessons.

The global lesson section also refers to and critiques the contributions of other scholars. It provides examples of hybrid policies and legal instruments driving them within other countries’ contexts. I have chosen to cite examples of European countries which I am familiar with rather than the US because I am not an expert on the latter.

- “6. In section 4 and 5 in policy recommendations the author could bring in examples of other countries - or give better examples of regulations (and legislations) that could support this hybrid renewable energy policy support system.”

The part of the revised paper providing for global lessons now gives examples of hybrid policies and statutes that embody them. Countries cited as examples include France and Slovenia.

- “7. The entire paper needs proper editing. There are certain words missing in sentences and sentence structure needs to be revised in different sections.”

I have done as advised.

ROUND 2

Dear Editors,

Please see the response to the three reviewers below.

Reviewer #1

“The author has addressed the review comments satisfactorily. The quality of the manuscript has been improved and the paper has a clearer flow and argumentation.”

This reviewer does not raise any concern.

Reviewer #2

“The author has not provided a proper document to indicate how he has answered or addressed the issues raised by the reviewers. This would have enabled a more specific and professional approach to addressing the points raised and how the author has changed it.”

By “proper document,” I guess this reviewer refers to a track-changed version of the paper showing the corrections made. Journals have their practices on this. Some journals require track-changed versions, others prefer clean versions, and some others ask for both. Moreover, when revision is substantial, many journals prefer a clean copy.

In any case, Energy Policy did not request me to provide a track-changed version of the revised paper. The instruction in the email sent by the corresponding editor reads: “A clean manuscript is preferred, rather than a 'marked up' version with the responses to reviewer's comments included.” The proper document in the context of Energy Policy is one showing each comment and how the author has addressed them, like I have done here.

“In the abstract and number of other places, sentences begin with 'i' - usually this is not the preferred practice in academia. Use of the first person needs to be avoided. The sentences need to be structured to a more academic style of writing using third person and past tense of reporting (that is how an academic research paper is written). For example Section 2 begins with a sentence which has 4 words.”

I have adjusted the tense and place of the pronouns used in the paper. It now reads in the third person and passive voice.

Nevertheless, this comment raises an interesting issue which I considered while deciding on my language style. Admittedly, academics have largely favoured the use of the third person pronoun and passive voice to give an impression of objectivity. However, this is no longer a hard rule (if you search on google, many universities and other academic institutions now state this clearly), as there are numerous instances of publications using first/second person pronouns and active voice (for empirical research on how these have been used, see Kuo, 1999). In fact,

some academics now disfavour the use of the third person pronoun and passive voice. I also know of journals that either officially ask authors to avoid these, describing them as unnecessary modesty, or undertake to respect the author's voice. Most journals do not provide any rule on this, hence leaving the same to the discretion of authors.

Having gone through the author guidelines again, I have not come across any prescription of Energy Policy on the use of person (first, second, third person pronoun at the subject or object stages) and voice (tense). This leaves it to authors' discretion. For example, several articles in Energy Policy have phrases like "we develop," "we argue," etc (see the last two issues of Energy Policy).

It is my opinion that in some social science and humanities fields that do not rely on hard data, the use of the first person pronoun and active voice makes academic writing and views more personal to the authors, giving them undeniable responsibilities for their ideas. It also prevents evasion since it is easy to avoid stating the subject of an action when using the passive voice (e.g. "it has been argued that," rather than "X has argued that").

"The subject matter of the article is interested, however, the article needs to undertake proper academic writing with improved referencing of published material in Energy Policy and other academic journals."

It is unclear what this reviewer implies by the term "proper academic writing." Several citations? I already have several publications from Energy Policy and other journals. Nonetheless, I have taken the opportunity to peruse more databases to see if there are relevant materials that could still be incorporated. As a result, I have now added more published materials. These include Özkaynak (2002), Stephens (2006, 2011, 2015), Kole (2015), Viebahn et al. (2007), Balat et al. (2009), Widjanarko and Ubaydullaev (2011), Kulichenko, and Ereira (2012), IRENA and CEM (2015), Grau (2013), Singer (1982), Ryan (2015), Crane and Kritzer (2010), Baxter and Jack (2008), Zucker (2009), Cooper (1988), Randolph (2009), Fisher et al (2007), Yanow (2000), Blyth et al (2015), Pye et al (2015), Levi and Pollitt (2015), Kannan (2009), Engelken (2016), Lowenberg (1990), Ruhl (1997), Zheng and Zu (2014), Heinzerling and Ackerman, 2002, 2003; Ackerman and Heinzerling, 2005. Some of these are from Energy Policy. I also found some distantly related publications in the recent issues of Energy Policy (e.g. Winkler et al, 2016; Ang et al, 2016) which I have excluded because they address economic and financial issues that do not really fit into my case study.

"There are too many writing and communication issues of ideas and concepts that are becoming difficult to overlook. In the previous draft of the paper these issues were highlighted but have not been addressed by the author appropriately."

I find it difficult to understand what this reviewer means by "many writing and communication issues of ideas and concepts." Perhaps, giving some examples would have helped. As the reviewer has referred to the previous draft of the paper, I have consulted the same.

The closest comments to "writing and communication" issues identified by Reviewer 1 are comment 3 on a typo error ("under the RE" instead of "under the FIT"), comment 4 on the undefined abbreviations, comment 5 on the need to rephrase a sentence, comment 6 on another typo error ("they would quality for incentives" instead of "they would qualify for incentives"), and comment 8 stating that the figure should be mentioned in the paper. Reviewer 2 also identified undefined abbreviations in comment 3, the need to rewrite the discussion and result

section in comment 4, and the need for proper editing in comment 7. These comments were thoroughly addressed in the paper and explained in the response to the previous reviewers. To avoid unnecessary repetition, please see the response to the previous reviewers.

In any case, I have used the opportunity to revise the paper again. I have improved the expressions that I think could be improved. For example, most of the paragraphs of the introduction have been rewritten or reorganised. The methodology and data section has also been improved and rearranged. I have also improved and edited the content of the result, discussion and conclusion sections.

“Section 2 literature review needs to be more robust as the paper is a review and using secondary data sources and published report;”

I am not sure what this comment addresses. There are two possibilities: (1) the literature review of section 2 is not robust; and (2) section two containing the literature review of the paper is not robust.

Assuming that the comment is in the first sense, I have cited more methodology literature in support of section 2. For how the qualitative method is used in law, I have cited Cane and Kritzer (2010) and Ryan (2015). For how the qualitative method is used in public policy, I have cited Fischer et al. (2007) and Yanow (2000). For the contextual requirement of the case study method, I have cited Baxter and Jack (2008) and Zucker (2009). For the method of literature review, I have cited Cooper (1988) and Randolph (2009). These conform to the author guideline which states “Methods already published should be indicated by a reference with only relevant modifications described” (Author Information Pack, p.7).

If the comment is in the second sense, then I need to reiterate the point that the article does not have a stand-alone literature review. This is integrated into the body, as the paper states. A stand-alone literature review is not necessary because the policy analysis essentially outlines the trajectory of the policy under the discussion section, and cites the relevant literature. An additional stand-alone literature review will be an unnecessary surplus, and might not give room for a more original contribution of the paper given the space constraint.

Moreover, Energy Policy does not encourage lengthy stand-alone literature reviews. The section of the Guide for Authors entitled “Background and Literature Review Sections” clearly states this. The editors of the journal also recently affirmed that “a separate literature review section is considered dispensable” (Brown, Jefferson, Madlener, Thomas, & Zhoue, 2016, p.1).

“...the section is not a good reflection of a thorough methodology of qualitative research.”

Qualitative research does not have a single approach. It has several applications in different fields (explanatory, exploratory, descriptive, intrinsic, instrumental, collective, within single cases and multiple cases, etc. see Baxter & Jack, 2008). For example, qualitative methods often used in anthropology, say ethnography, take a different approach from the more open-ended ones that may be used in law and public policy, such as a case study. For examples of how the qualitative method is applied in fields such as law, please see a recent Oxford publication entitled “Empirical Legal Research,” edited by Cane and Kritzer (2010) and a recent article by Ryan (2015) in Perspectives. A 2007 book by CRC Press, edited by Fischer, Miller, and Sidney, as well as Yanow’s 2000 piece on interpretive policy analysis also shows how qualitative methods are used by public policy scholars.

Interdisciplinary journals are aware of the diversity in the use of qualitative methods, hence the reason you see a melange of qualitative research applications in their issues. To be clear, I have applied the case study method as applicable to law and public policy, and have stated this in the revised paper. Having cited the relevant methodology literature, Energy Policy only requires me to explain the modifications to published methods (see Author Information Pack, p.7).

The case study method requires the in-depth description and analysis (see, e.g., Hancock, 1998; Baxter & Jack, 2008; Zucker, 2009) of the subject matter in its context, often with the goal to produce reasonable generalisations (which is a common criticism of this method). However, I have used the method to produce lessons not intended to be transplants. To avoid any doubt, the revised paper has now also explicitly identified its case study goal as the production of lessons, not generalisations.

As for the exact steps taken, the result section of the paper mostly provides an in-depth description of the contract for difference and capacity market case in its context. Then the discussion section largely analyses the case to produce lessons. As such, the paper properly applies the case study method.

Further to this, the case study method may rely on several kinds of instruments including interviews and documents (see, e.g., Baxter & Jack, 2008). When used in policy analysis, it often relies on documents. As my paper applies the case study method for policy analysis, I have relied on documents. It can also use several kinds of reporting systems, and I have chosen to use the narrative and descriptive reporting systems. I have chosen a very useful public policy analysis tool, the policy cycle, for these.

I have also used the qualitative literature review method. My review is representative, using Cooper's taxonomy (see Cooper, 1988; Randolph, 2009). I have also stated this clearly in the revised paper. The review is integrated into the body of the text, as there is no need for a separate literature review especially since the policy cycle requires one to discuss the agenda setting which essentially sets the context of a policy, hence showing why a policy emerges. In setting the context, I have cited relevant literature. This agenda also shows the gap in the literature: only a few scholars have recently considered the possibility of combining support mechanisms. See the last paragraph in 3.1.3. The revised manuscript has now added the point that none of them has conceptualized such combination (last paragraph of section 3.1.3.) and most commentators have focused on market profitability over environmental protection in the liberal framework (last paragraph of section 3.1.4).

“Section 4 discussion and 4.5 implications for policy in UK has no substantial evidence for statements or conclusions drawn.”

Section 4, discussion, builds on section 3, result. Section 3 contextualizes the hybrid policy through the policy trajectory, while section 4 then conceptualises the hybrid policy based on the result in section 3. As such, the discussion in section 4 relies on the evidence provided in the result in section 3. This is a customary way of reporting and analysing research results. This suggests that one should be looking for the evidence in section 3, not section 4.

It is inefficient to repeat the evidence in section 4. In not only policy analysis but also other systematic research (especially in sciences and social sciences where research results are reported in sections delineated as introduction, method, result, discussion and conclusion), once evidence is presented in the result section, the discussion section then focuses more on

the original contribution. Even the editors of Energy Policy have recently emphasised the importance of this original contribution, describing it as “sufficient contribution to the advancement of thinking about energy policy” (Brown, Jefferson, Madlener, Thomas, & Zhoue, 2016, p.2).

The foregoing extends to the other half of the reviewer’s comment on section “4.5” (I guess the reviewer erroneously refers the comment to section 4.5 instead of section 4.4., since section 4.5 focuses on global lessons and already cites several country examples as evidence while section 4.4 is the one that provides for the UK lessons). As the heading of section 4.4 shows, the section focuses on the lessons that could be drawn from the policy analysis. Drawing lessons at that point requires arguments, not evidence, given that the evidence has already been adduced (of course there will be the need for new evidence where new claims are brought in, like under section 4.5, but section 4.4 does not bring in new claims, but only makes assessments based on the policy analysis and the literature). I could explain the relationship between claim, evidence, and analysis with a chain: Claims necessitate and lead to evidence; evidence necessitates and leads to analysis; and analysis leads to and support lessons. While this progression may vary among researchers, it presents the key components.

Perhaps, by evidence, the reviewer might also be referring to the literature. If this is the case, every argument I have made is backed by either the literature or the result of the policy trajectory or both. Let me bring in some examples.

I argue that the Contracts for Difference and Capacity Market (CFD & CM) policy may encourage investors mainly attracted by a guaranteed reward scheme (Whitmill, 2012), and also suggest the innovation recommendations of some scholars (Bolton and Foxon, 2015; Finon, 2013; Kozlov, 2014) to address this. I also identify the concerns raised about the retention of government control (Bolton and Foxon, 2015), and then identify the need for government regulation to ensure that prices are not unreasonable, the system is not dysfunctional, and overall public interest is protected, as the policy trajectory has shown. For example, the government ensures that generators pay back the difference where the market price exceeds the strike price to reduce the costs that pass to the public (DECC, 2015; see also Oak et al., 2015). To make this point clearer, I have cited this example in the revised paper.

Another criticism that I address is the one raised by Mueller (2014), Darwall (2015) and a few other authors identified in the paper, that the low carbon policy transfers the costs of financing a currently unstable renewable energy sector to the private sector while under government control, and the private sector cannot change this due to government control. I have exhaustively discussed the involvement of the government in the policy trajectory, hence no need restating this. My response to this criticism therefore stems from the discussion section of the paper: first, under the low carbon regime, the role of the government is minimal as there is room for negotiations; my second response is trite in that it is generally accepted that governments should perform regulatory and monitoring functions (even new or modern liberals agree to this).

I also claim that most of the other criticisms stem from neo-classical economic thinking, focusing on how rational persons make decisions on demand and supply to maximise benefits until they achieve utility. I support this with the literature (Bolton and Foxon, 2015, p.177). The revised paper has now developed this point further and cited additional literature (Adaman and Özkaynak, 2002; Ruhl, 1997; Singer, 1982). In reality, neo-classical economics is still prevalent, so this point is not farfetched. Another argument I could make is by referring to the

background and affiliations of the critics to show their bias for neo-classical approaches, but I have decided not to go this far because some might feel slighted.

I now turn to address the final part of the comment on whether the evidence is substantial. The phrase “substantial evidence” has a technical usage in law as applicable to briefs, but I assume this reviewer intends to use it for the data (because reference to legal evidence is unsuitable in the context of the paper). To address whether the data is substantial, I discuss the type of research, and then identify the type of evidence that might be considered suitable.

First, whether or not evidence is substantial depends on the type of research. Evidence considered substantial for geography might not be substantial in law and policy, and vice versa. My paper is on law and policy, and employs the qualitative method. This means it is exploratory in nature, aimed at understanding ideas, reasons, opinions, motivations, etc. As a qualitative study, it provides insights into two problems which the revised paper has now made more succinct: disagreement about traditional policies, and ambiguity and misdirection of policy goals. To address the two problems, the paper developed the thesis that hybrid renewable energy policy might combine different support mechanisms to drive desirable objectives. In this case, the CFD & CM policy has emerged as a hybrid of the contracts for Difference (CFD) and the Capacity Market (CM) to advance environmental protection where traditional policies have failed. To prove the thesis, it explores the policy trajectory, and then deconstructs the hybrid model. The exploration (contextualisation of the hybrid policy) addresses the second problem on policy objectives, and the deconstruction (conceptualisation of the hybrid policy) addresses the first problem on the disagreement on policy models. Consistent with one of the functions of a qualitative study, the thesis of the paper could form a hypothesis useful for future quantitative research.

Second, what type of evidence is suitable and substantial for this qualitative research? Since the study is a policy analysis (and a subset of qualitative research) of a new mechanism (the CFD & CM) governed by a new law (Energy Act 2013) and the regulations therefrom, it requires statutory data found in enabling laws (note that the data often used in law and sometimes used in public policy are in form of statutes, cases, codes, customary law, etc, depending on the legal families, say common, civil, Islamic, aboriginal/customary, etc), and historical, descriptive and experiential data found in policy documents and the literature. I have used these variety in the paper, and have drawn my conclusions therefrom. These are therefore substantial for the conclusions.

Note that I identified some of the evidence in the response to the previous reviewers. To briefly outline other examples, the legal and historical, descriptive and experiential evidence in section 3 come from policy documents and the literature. I used several of these (e.g. policy documents from the Department of Trade and Industry, Cabinet Office, European Union Parliament and the Council of EU, House of Lords European Union Committee, Renewable Energy Policy Database and Support etc, and publications too numerous to outline here).

Reviewer #3

“The paper evaluates the hybrid RE in the power sector. I have been reviewing the UK's FiT scheme for quite sometimes and I believe the author brings a different dimension when discussing the hybrid policies and this will stimulate new knowledge to readers. The author already addressed all comments from reviewers, and as it is, I believe the paper is already excellent.”

This reviewer does not raise any issue.