Analyzing the Economic Development-Driven Ecological Deficit in the EU-15 Countries: New Evidence From PSTR Approach

Celil Aydin (✉ caydin@bandirma.edu.tr)
  Bandirma Onyedi Eylul Universitesi   https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0398-9884
Ömer ESEN
  Namık Kemal Üniversitesi: Tekirdag Namik Kemal Universitesi
Recai AYDIN
  Ankara Sosyal Bilimler Üniversitesi: Ankara Sosyal Bilimler Universitesi

---

Analyzing the economic development-driven ecological deficit in the EU-15 countries: New evidence from PSTR approach

Celil AYDIN[1][*], Ömer ESEN[2] and Recai AYDIN[3]

Abstract

This study empirically analyses the nonlinear impact of economic activities on ecological balance indicators that estimate the balance between economies' pressure on nature and the biologically productive resources areas affected by human activity and the earth's ecological carrying capacity. In measuring this balance, ecological balance sheet indicators are divided into four sub-components; cropland, forest area, fishing grounds and grazing land. The sample of the study consists of the EU-15 countries over the period 1995-2016. In order to render the study robust with respect to econometric issues like potential endogeneity bias, cross-country heterogeneity, time instability and nonlinearity, the study adopted panel smooth transition regression (PSTR) method. The empirical findings reveal that the economic activities carried out up to a certain threshold level do not force the ecological balance as nature can compensate for the resulting externalities, but beyond this threshold, waste accumulation and pollution exceed nature's capacity to absorb. Consequently, the results of the study are not in line with the expectation of the Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC) hypothesis with inverted U-shaped curve, but indicate a need for implementation of active environmental policies for the improvement of the environment.

Keywords: Ecological Balance Sheet, Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC), Panel Smooth Transition Regression (PSTR).

1. Introduction

Evidence regarding the interrelation between ecological and economic systems shows that economic activities and ecological changes have mutual effects on each other. In particular, disposal of the waste products of economic activities can be damaging to the ecology and interfere with the mutually supporting interactions within the ecological system. With the increasing pace and volume of economic activity ever increasing in volume, the burden on the ecological system is becoming correspondingly greater. Consumption of resources faster than rate of the renewal destroys the natural ecosystems on which the human life and biodiversity depend. As a result, many negative externalities contributing to

---

[1] Assoc. Prof., Department of Economics, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Bandırma Onyedi Eylül University, 10200, Balıkesir, Turkey E-mail: caydin@bandirma.edu.tr
[2] Assoc. Prof., Department of Economics, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Namık Kemal University, 59030 Tekirdağ, Turkey E-mail: oesen@nku.edu.tr
[3] Prof. Dr., Department of Economics, Faculty of Political Sciences, Social Sciences University of Ankara, 06050 Ankara, Turkey E-mail: recai.aydin@asbu.edu.tr
[*] Corresponding Author

29   global climate change such as decreasing forest areas, exhaustion of freshwater systems and increased

30   carbon dioxide emissions are becoming increasingly damaging (Özsoy and Dinç, 2016). In recognition

31   of this process, countries' goals should encompass both economic growth as traditionally measured and

32   the sustainability of the process as well. Economic policies aiming at increasing welfare must therefore

33   consider the economy and the environment as interdependent systems. In other words, it is crucial for

34   countries, regions as well as any global initiative to understand that economic actions create pressure on

35   ecosystems while they create economic growth and take into consideration this pressure before taking

36   any policy decisions.

37   Human beings leave a mark on the earth while carrying out the production and consumption activities

38   throughout their life. However, as they carry out these activities, they little notice the spillover effects

39   on nature and the resulting pressure on the ecosystem, with the consequence that the ecological carrying

40   capacity may be exceeded. Such overutilization in order that the biological capacity (bio-capacity) be

41   preserved to create a balance between the resource requirements of current and future generations. In

42   other words, to achieve sustainability, the natural resource consumption should not exceed the volume

43   of the resources that the earth can regenerate them within a given time frame. The earth, where all living

44   things continue their lives is inadequate to meet the needs due to the use of resources above the

45   Biological Capacity (BC) —defined as the capacity of a geographical region to produce renewable

46   natural resources. For this target, the Ecological Footprint (EF) measurements are seen as a vital

47   measurement tool in the preparation of environmentally friendly policies required while ensuring

48   economic development.

49   Following pioneering studies by Rees (1992), Rees and Wackernagel (1994) and Wackernagel and Rees

50   (1996), the ecological footprint measures are being increasingly employed in studies applied to

51   geographic regions, countries and specific productive activities. Given the available technology and

52   resource management , the EF, which measures the amount of the biologically productive soil and water

53   areas (cropland, built-up land, forest land, grazing land, carbon uptake land and fishing grounds)

54   required to reproduce the natural resources consumed by individuals, countries or activities in a given

55   period and to absorb the waste creates, provides insight into how far the limits of the carrying capacity

56   of the earth have been exceeded, rather than giving precise judgments. In this respect, the comparison

57   of EF and BC indicates whether the earth can live within the limits of self-renewal.

58   An ecological deficit is observed when the EF of a country's (a particular person, society or economy)

59   population exceeds the bio-capacity of that country's area. Under deficit conditions, natural resources

60   are exhausted, environmental problems appear and it becomes difficult for a population to meet its

61   needs. In contrast, an ecological reserve exists whenever a population's EC is below its region's bio-

62   capacity.

63 The discussion on whether ecological resources are sufficient to attain sustainable economic growth
64 began in the early 1970s. The Club of Rome's *"Limits to Growth"* approach, which posits that
65 environmental quality will deteriorate with economic activity, has resonated in political and academic
66 platforms and has become an effective argument. It is argued that the earth cannot provide the need for
67 natural resources, clean, accessible water and fresh air if the population growth and economic
68 development continue in this way (Meadows et al., 1972). These debates are a considerable warning in
69 terms of drawing attention to the damage caused by economic activities on the earth's ecosystems and
70 natural resources. This approach has also sparked the wick of a consensus on acting on a common
71 platform against environmental issues.

72 However, the findings of many studies on potential environmental impacts of economic growth, such as
73 Grossman and Krueger (1991, 1995), Beckerman (1992), Shafik and Bandyopadhyay (1992), Panayotou
74 (1993), and Selden and Song (1994) in the early 1990s have led to doubts about the Limits of Growth
75 paradigm, and new arguments have been put forward. This approach suggests that there is no positive
76 or negative linear relationship between economic activities and environmental quality, in fact,
77 environmental quality follows an inverted U-shaped pattern that initially falls and then rises as a function
78 of per capita income. The basic notion of this approach which is also referred to as environmental
79 Kuznets curve (henceforth EKC) hypothesis in the literature, is that as an economy develops,
80 environmental deteriorations initially increase during the early development or industrialization stages
81 and then tend to fall as they reach higher income per capita due to awareness of people and increased
82 demand for a clean environment.

83 The fact that many natural disasters (such as hurricanes, floods, droughts, extreme cold and heat), which
84 are thought to be caused by global climate changes in recent decades, and the effect of human -induced
85 activities on environmental degradation led to re-thinking on the economic growth process and re-
86 questioning the EKC hypothesis. Some studies that find it wrong to have very optimistic expectations
87 about the future of the world by considering the data that environmental degradation is decreasing in
88 developed countries, draw attention to the global pollution, the situation of developing countries, and
89 the pollutants that have irreversible effects.

90 Although the EKC hypothesis is interesting in terms of modeling environment-growth relationship or
91 providing an alternative perspective on explaining the relationship, the EKC approach and its political
92 propositions have started to be criticized in many respects by some theoretical and empirical research
93 seeking answers to the question of how to achieve sustainable development. Criticisms of the EKC
94 approach may generally be grouped under three headings.

95 The first point of these criticisms is that the typical inverted U-shaped EKC pattern implies that the
96 environmental damage is not cumulative or its effects to the ecosystem can be reversed (Arrow et al.,
97 1995; Tisdell, 2001, 2002; Bimonte, 2002; Tao et al., 2008; Czech, 2008; Caviglia-Harris et al., 2009;

98 Fodha and Zaghdoud, 2010; Aydin et al., 2019; Esen et al., 2020). Some pollutants are cumulative, that
99 is, they tend to accumulate in the environment (Tisdell, 2000). Furthermore, even if pollutants do not
100 accumulate initially, they may begin to accumulate after a certain threshold capacity level is exceeded.
101 Moreover, the direct impacts of some pollutants on the environment may be relatively small
102 individually, but major environmental effects may occur when combined with others (Cooper, 2004;
103 Solomon et al., 2016). Therefore, cumulative impacts may be difficult to predict and monitor due to
104 insufficient environmental data, nature's reaction taking relatively long times, and complex ecological
105 processes (Clark, 1994). Also, even if environmental investments increase as incomes rise, resources
106 such as biodiversity may not be renewed to the extent that they are lost. In this case, biodiversity loss is,
107 on any reasonable scale, essentially irreversible and monotonic as there is no threshold point as a
108 function of income per capita (Tisdell, 1993; Asafu-Adjaye, 2003; Dietz and Adger, 2003; Simpson et
109 al., 2005; Czech, 2008; Mills and Waite, 2009; Irité, 2015; Ruiz–Agudelo et al., 2019).

110 The second consideration is that the EKC hypothesis, which is analyzed empirically, can only be valid
111 for pollutants that have local and regional dimensions but not at the global level and their negative
112 impact can be controlled with only limited effects on economic growth. Critics of the EKC often claim
113 that these are the pollutants that involve local, direct and short-term costs, which have destructive effects
114 which are limited to the environment of the area where they are being released (for example SOx, NOx,
115 SPM, etc.). However, the EKC-type relation may not be meaningful for the accumulated stocks of waste,
116 for pollutants involving relatively long-term social costs (eg.CO_2) or for resource stocks (Holtz–Eakin
117 and Selden, 1995; Arrow et al, 1995; Stern et al, 1996; Panayotou, 1997; Cavlovic et al., 2000; Lieb,
118 2003; York et al., 2003; Salvati and Zitti, 2008; Esen et al., 2020).

119 Thirdly, studies have been critical of the EKC evidence on the grounds that the functional specifications
120 and econometric techniques employed could not capture actual shape of income–environmental quality
121 relation (Stern, 1998; Romero-Ávila, 2008; Bagliani et al., 2008; Galeotti et al., 2009; Esteve and
122 Tamarit, 2012; Chiu, 2012; Aydin et al., 2019; Esen et al., 2020). Majority of the studies cited above
123 have usually adopted reduced-form models in which per capita income is based on a quadratic or cubic
124 function. In these studies, the aim is to find the potential nonlinearity of the underlying function with
125 strategies such as logarithmic transforms or cubic functions (He and Richard, 2010). However, this
126 approach cannot have the flexibility to determine the true form of the relationship. Imposing a priori any
127 parametric (eg. linear, nonlinear, quadratic or cubic) function or predetermining the types of models can
128 lead to the selection of inappropriate models that may offer biased findings.

129 To sum up, this study aims to empirically examine the effect of income per capita on ecological deficit
130 by using a large dataset for the EU-15 covering the period 1995-2016. The starting period of the study
131 is determined by taking into account the White Paper "An energy policy for the European Union"
132 outlining a common energy and environmental policy among the member states, adopted in 1995
133 (European Commission, 1995). To obtain a homogenous group of countries, each with a similar

134   development status and policy approach, the sample involves the EU-15 countries that have taken

135   common actions with regard to energy and environmental policy during the sample period. Failure to

136   identify the appropriate country group in panel data analysis methods can have a seriously misleading

137   effect on the findings and their policy implications, a problem this study avoids by employing data for

138   countries following similar policies.

139   More specifically, this study makes two original contributions to ongoing debates in the literature

140   regarding the analysis of the EKC hypothesis. Firstly, the inverse U-shaped pattern may be valid only

141   for certain types of pollutants, especially atmospheric ones, while not being valid for the accumulated

142   stocks of waste. It is also claimed that the EKC-type relation is likely to be more limited or weak where

143   the feedback impacts of resource stocks including soil, forests and other ecosystems are meaningful

144   (Arrow et al, 1995). To provide a more complete perspective, this study adopts both the total ecological

145   deficit and its disaggregated components as new indicators of environmental degradation, which reveals

146   the quantity of pressure on natural resource stocks (ecological assets) and where they originate,

147   comparing the ecological footprint from human activities with the number of natural resources that can

148   be produced in the same period, that is, with biological capacity. It is an important environmental

149   indicator that determines to what extent human activities exceed basically two types of environmental

150   limits, such as resource production and waste absorption (Wackernagel et al, 2004; Schaefer et al, 2006;

151   Rugani et al, 2014). To contribute to the determination of the areas where the ecological deficit is

152   concentrated and to better plan the efficient use of resources, the present study examines the ecological

153   deficit both in total and in the sub-components, separated according to the major types of ecologically

154   productive areas — grazing land, cropland, forest area and fishing grounds.

155   Secondly, in contrast to conventional parametric approaches, this study adopts the PSTR model as an

156   innovative econometric technique that estimates the threshold level endogenously and allows a smooth

157   change from one regime to another. Another advantage of this model is its ability to consider

158   econometric issues such as potential endogeneity biases, nonlinearity, heterogeneity and time instability

159   (Chiu, 2012; Wu et al, 2013). To the best of the authors' knowledge, this study is the first to adopt a

160   PSTR model to the linkages between income and an ecological deficit. The motivation behind the choice

161   of the PSTR model is based on the fact that contrary to the conventional econometric methods applied

162   in previous studies, this empirical technique puts forward a strong solution to the EKC hypothesis and

163   its empirical research, especially methodological criticisms.

164   To this end, the remainder of this study is organized as follows: Section 2 highlights the review of the

165   literature on the environment–income relationship. Section 3 describes data, the methodology, and the

166   empirical model. Section 4 provides and discusses the empirical findings, and finally Section 5 presents

167   concluding remarks.

168   **2. Literature review**

169   Empirical findings in the literature testing the validity of the EKC differ and are quite mixed, depending
170   on the types of pollutants selected, samples of countries/regions and time periods studied, the
171   econometric techniques applied and other explanatory variables used in the model. Among these studies,
172   Panayotou (1993), List and Gallet (1999), Bhattarai and Hammig (2001), Kahuthu (2006), Jalil and
173   Mahmud (2009), Iwata et al. (2010), Fodha and Zaghdoud (2010), Nasir and Rehman (2011), Shahbaz
174   et al. (2012), Saboori et al. (2012), Shahbaz et al. (2013), López-Menéndez et al. (2014), Lau et al.
175   (2014), Shahbaz et al. (2014), Apergis and Ozturk (2015), Apergis (2016), Balaguer and Cantavella
176   (2016), Jebli et al. (2016), Li et al. (2016), Wang et al. (2016), Ahmad et al. (2017), Solarin et al. (2017),
177   Luo et al. (2017), Moutinho et al. (2017), and Dogan and Inglesi-Lotz (2020) have provided evidence
178   of the validity of the EKC hypothesis and confirmed the inverted U-shape, whereas Agras and Chapman
179   (1999), Koop and Tole (1999), Cole (2003), Richmond and Kaufmann (2006), Akbostanci et al. (2009),
180   Caviglia-Harris et al. (2009), Luzzati and Orsini (2009), Ozturk and Acaravci (2010), Kearsley and
181   Riddel (2010), He and Richard (2010), Pao et al. (2011), Azlina et al. (2014), Baek (2015), Robalino-
182   López et al. (2015), Al-Mulali et al. (2015), Ozturk and Al-Mulali (2015), Katz (2015), Zoundi (2017),
183   and Liu et al. (2017) have found either no evidence or weak evidence in support of an inverted U-shape.
184   However, most of the aforementioned studies (and many others) in the literature on EKCs cited so far
185   use either a specific pollution scale such as SOx, NOx, SPM, etc. or a global pollution scale such as
186   $CO2$ as indicators of environmental quality. The problem with focusing on these particular pollutants is
187   that they represent only a small part of total environmental issues (Al-Mulali et al., 2015a; Hervieux and
188   Darné, 2015; Destek et al., 2018; Imamoglu, 2018).

189   In the literature, the association between income and environment is widely researched; however, the
190   availability of studies related to an ecological deficit or its derivatives, which are considered to represent
191   the overall human impact on the earth's ecosystem and the current state of stock resources relatively
192   more accurately, remains limited. Among these studies, York et al. (2004) examined the cross-national
193   variation in the ecological footprint (EF) per unit of income utilizing data on 139 countries in 1999. The
194   findings reveal that economic development leads to greater environmental impacts and is unlikely to
195   ensure sustainability. A study by Hervieux and Darné (2015) analysed the EKC hypothesis using
196   conventional linear, quadratic and cubic functions, with standard and logarithmic specifications using
197   time-series analysis for 7 Latin American countries over the period 1961-2007. Similarly, the finding
198   that environmental degradation does not improve when income increases, emphasizes that the EKC is
199   not valid for EF. Adopting the PSTR model, Aydin et al. (2019) examined the EKC hypothesis
200   associating with EF for 26 EU countries and found weak evidence in favor of an inverted U-shaped
201   relationship between per capita income and EF. Similar findings were found in 141 countries by Bagliani
202   et al (2008) utilizing ordinary least squares (OLS) and weighted least squares (WLS) analysis on linear,
203   quadratic and cubic functions, in standard and logarithmic specifications, in 146 countries by Caviglia-
204   Harris et al. (2009), in 150 nations with populations over 1 million by Wang et al. (2013) using a spatial

econometric approach, and in 94 countries by Paolo Miglietta et al. (2017) using the OLS on linear and nonlinear models.

In contrast, Aşıcı and Acar (2016) examines the economy-environment relationship using the panel data set of 150 countries' EF over the period 2004–2008. The findings confirm that there is an EKC type relationship between per capita income and the footprint of domestic production. Similar results were found in Qatar by Mrabet and Alsamara (2017) employing the autoregressive distributed lag (ARDL) model with the presence of unknown structural breaks, in the MENA countries by Charfeddine and Mrabet (2017) using panel cointegration and causality analysis, in 15 EU countries by Destek et al. (2018) adopting second generation panel data methods that consider possible cross- section dependence among countries, and in 11 newly industrialized countries by Destek and Sarkodie (2019) employing both augmented mean group (AMG) estimator and the heterogeneous panel causality method. Apart from these, Al-Mulali et al. (2015) found an EKC-type relation in upper middle- and high-income countries, but not in low- and lower middle-income countries, in a study of 93 countries using fixed effects and generalized moments (GMM) models, similar to Uddin et al. (2016) which provides evidence in favor of the EKC hypothesis in 10 countries of 22, but in others either absent or weak evidence.

Ecological Deficit measures are of great importance in terms of determining whether Earth's biological resources and ecosystem services are used within the boundary of self-renewal and creating a scientific basis for effective and feasible solutions to eliminate the imbalance caused by today's excessive consumption. To the best of our knowledge, however, in reviewing the literature, it is seen that there is no study in the framework of the EKC hypothesis that takes into account the ecological deficit variable as an indicator of environmental quality.

3. Methodology

This study aims to find out the relationship between ecological balance[4] and economic growth. In order to achieve this goal, panel smooth transition regression model which was used by various studies including Bagliani et al. (2008), Al-mulali et al. (2015), Uddin et al. (2017) and Aydin et al. (2019) is employed. The model is explained in detail Aydin et al. (2019) and is presented in Equation (1);

$$EB_{i,t} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Growth_{i,t} + \theta X_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \tag{1}$$

where *EB* represents ecological balance; *Growth* is the GDP growth rate, *X* represents other macroeconomic variables that might have an impact on ecological balance; ε is the error term where t = 1, 2, …, T for time periods; and i =1, 2, 3…, N for N countries.

The original model, Panel Threshold Regression (PTR) model, was introduced by Hansen (1999) as the first regression model which allows to determine regime-switching moments in the econometric model

---

[4] Ecological balance is the difference between the bio-capacity and ecological footprint of a region or country.

238 analyzing the nonlinear relationship among the variables in panel data. Thus, it indicates on which time
239 period the effect of the threshold variable on the dependent variable changes its direction and allows the
240 researcher to compare the impact in regimes below or above the threshold. This situation causes the
241 slope parameters to differ according to regime-switching mechanism that depends on the threshold
242 variable. In the PTR approach, it is assumed that slope parameters vary suddenly and each regime differs
243 with respect to the detected threshold value. However, it may not be possible to observe these sudden
244 changes among the regimes in economic models (Güloğlu ve Nazlıoğlu, 2013: 11).

245 This approach classifies the countries in the panel data with respect to their per capita real GDP values
246 and estimates a different set of parameters for each group in evaluating the relationship between
247 ecological balance and per capita real GDP. As a result, this approach is built based on the assumption
248 that there are certain differences between high per capita real GDP countries and low per capita real
249 GDP countries. This assumption technically allows a developing country near the threshold to become
250 suddenly a developed country. However, in reality, this switch does not happen in one period but
251 happens over a longer period of time. Thus, estimated parameters change not instantly but smoothly.
252 Therefore, the Panel Smooth Transition Regression (PTSR) approach which allows gradual transition
253 of parameters from one regime to another is preferred in this study rather than the original PTR model.
254 The method was introduced by Gonzalez, Terasvirta and Van Dijk (2005).

255 Non-linear relationship between ecological balance and economic growth is analyzed by using the
256 transformed version of the model shown in Equation (1) into a two-regime fixed PTSR model shown in
257 Equation (2):

$$EB_{i,t} = \mu_i + \beta_0 LnGDP_{i,t} + \beta_1 LnGDP_{i,t} * g(q_{i,t}; \gamma, \theta) + \varepsilon_{i,t} \tag{2}$$

259 where *EB* represents logarithmic transformed value of per capita ecological balance; *LnGDP* represents
260 logarithmic transformed value of per capita real GDP; ε represents the error term; t = 1, 2, …, T
261 represents time periods; and i=1, 2, 3…, N represents countries included in the analysis. Coefficient μ_i
262 is included to observe possible unit-specific fixed effects, and the variable q_i is included to be used as a
263 potential threshold variable. In Equation (2), the function of $g(q_{i,t}; \gamma, \theta)$ is assumed to be logistic
264 function and is included as a transition function, and explicitly is given in Equation (3):

$$g(q_{i,t}; \gamma, \theta) = [1 + exp(-\gamma(q_{i,t} - \theta))]^{-1} \tag{3}$$

266 In equation (3), the parameter of θ is a threshold parameter between two regimes which are represented
267 by $g(q_{i,t}; \gamma, \theta) = 0$ and $g(q_{i,t}; \gamma, \theta) = 1$, and the parameter of γ is the smoothness measure in the
268 model with the aim of capturing the change in the value of the transition function (smoothness
269 parameter). In other words, it reflects the nature of transition from one regime to another regime. The
270 value of γ approaching infinity ($\gamma \rightarrow \infty$), as the smoothness parameter, indicates that transition from 0
271 to 1 does not happen instantly, unlike the PTR approach in which θ is the threshold parameter and the

272 switching from one regime to another happens abruptly. In this situation, using the PTR approach will

273 be proper to estimate the model. On the other hand, as the smoothness parameter approaches to zero

274 ($\gamma \to 0$) the transition function turns out to be a constant number and the estimation model is reduced

275 to linear form. In this situation, panel within estimator as suggested by Fouquau et al. (2008; 287-288)

276 will be more appropriate to estimate the model.

277 The transition function can take on values between 0 and 1 as it is a continuous function of the transition

278 variable. In that regard, in equation (1), the regression coefficient becomes β_0 when the transition

279 function takes the value of zero ($g(q_{i,t}; \gamma, \theta) = 0$) and the regression coefficient becomes $\beta_0 + \beta_1$ when

280 the transition function takes the value of one ($g(q_{i,t}; \gamma, \theta) = 1$). In other words, the regression

281 coefficient becomes the weighted average of β_0 and β_1 when the resulting value of the transition

282 function turns out to be between zero and one ($0 < g(q_{i,t}; \gamma, \theta) < 1$). Therefore, it is better to interpret

283 only the signs of the coefficients in the PTSR model rather than interpret the coefficients directly

284 (Fouquau et al., 2008; 287-288). In other words, the positive or negative impact on dependent variable

285 caused by the independent variable can be estimated, hence allowing varying elasticities with respect to

286 different time periods to be explained (Güloğlu ve Nazlıoğlu, 2013: 12).

287 PSTR model can result in two regimes as well as with more than two regimes. A version of PTSR model

288 with more than two regimes is given in equation (3). The transition function with more than two regimes

289 in PTSR model is given in equation (4) below.

290 $$EB_{i,t} = \mu_i + \beta_0 LnGDP_{i,t} + \sum_{j=1}^{r} \beta_j LnGDP_{i,t} * g_j\left(q_{i,t}^{(j)}; \gamma_j, \theta_j\right) + u_{i,t} \tag{3}$$

291 $$g(q_{i,t}; \gamma, \theta) = \left[1 + exp\left(-\gamma \prod_{j=1}^{m}(q_{i,t} - \theta_j)\right)\right]^{-1}, \gamma > 0, c_1 \le c_2 \le \cdots \le c_m \tag{4}$$

292 Equation (5) provides the formula to calculate elasticity measure for the case in which the transition or

293 threshold variable (q) is different than the dependent variable ($q \ne LnGDP_{i,t}$) in PSTR model with three

294 or more regimes.

295 $$e_{i,t} = \frac{\partial EB_{i,t}}{\partial LnGDP_{i,t}} = \beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{r} \beta_j * g_j\left(q_{i,t}^{(j)}; \gamma_j, \theta_j\right) \tag{5}$$

296 Equation (6) provides the formula to calculate the elasticity measure for the case in which the transition

297 or threshold variable (q) is equal to the dependent variable ($q = LnGDP_{i,t}$) in PSTR model with three

298 or more regimes.

299 $$e_{i,t} = \frac{\partial EB_{i,t}}{\partial LnGDP_{i,t}} = \beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{r} \beta_j * g_j\left(q_{i,t}^{(j)}; \gamma_j, \theta_j\right) + \sum_{j=1}^{r} \beta_j \frac{\partial g_j\left(q_{i,t}^{(j)}; \gamma_j, \theta_j\right)}{\partial LnGDP_{i,t}} LnGDP_{i,t} \tag{6}$$

300 There are three steps in PSTR analysis. These are; testing for linearity, determination of appropriate

301 number of regimes (r) and model estimation (Fouquau et al., 2008; 287-288). Testing for linearity is

302 achieved under the hypotheses $\gamma = 0$ or $\beta_0 = \beta_1 = 0$. However, the test statistics is not standard as

303   there are some undefined parameters under the null hypotheses in both cases. As a result, a first degree

304   Taylor expansion of $\gamma = 0$ is employed. Using the standard F-test to test for linearity, linear model is

305   employed in the case of non-rejection of the null hypothesis PSTR model is employed if the null

306   hypothesis is rejected.

307   If the linear model is rejected, then appropriate number of regimes is found testing the null hypothesis

308   of *r=r*=1* against the alternative hypothesis of *r=r*+1*. If the null hypothesis cannot be rejected, then

309   the existence of only one switching regime is considered. If the null hypothesis is rejected, then the new

310   null hypothesis of *r=r*+1* is tested against the alternative hypothesis of *r=r*+2*. This process is

311   continued as long as the null hypothesis can be rejected as it was suggested by Fouquau et al. (2008;

312   287-288). Once the correct number of regimes are found, transformed model is estimated using the

313   nonlinear least squares method (NLS) following subtracting the fixed effects of cross-sections from the

314   time average values of the variables in the estimation stage (Gonzalez et al., 2005).

315   **4. Data, Empirical Results, and Implications**

316   *4.1. Data Specifications*

317   In this study, the non-linear relationship between ecological balance and economic growth as well as

318   the non-linear relationship between economic growth and each of the equilibria that determine

319   ecological balance in areas of Cropland, Fishing Grounds, Forest Products and Grazing Land are

320   investigated in five separate models by using PSTR approach for 13 EU countries for the period of 1995-

321   2016. Following countries with available full data set are included in the study: Austria, Belgium,

322   Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and

323   United Kingdom. Finland and Ireland are excluded from this study since their detailed sub-component

324   data are not available.

325   In the models employed, each of the following variables--Cropland balance sheet (*CBS*), Fishing

326   grounds balance sheet (*FBS*), Forest products balance sheet (*FOBS*), Grazing land balance sheet (*GBS*)

327   and Ecological balance sheet (*EBS*)--is employed as the dependent variable while the logarithm of per

328   capita real GDP (*LnGDPper*) is included as the main independent variable of interest as an indicator of

329   economic growth as well as the threshold variable for the models. In addition, other independent

330   variables including the logarithm of energy consumption (*LnEnergy*), urbanization rate (*Urbanization*)

331   and age dependency ratio (*Dependency*) are used as control variables in the model. Since it is assumed

332   that all carbon uptake is considered within the biological capacity of other productive areas such as

333   forest area, cropland, grazing land, forest land, and fishing grounds, there is no bio-capacity

334   corresponding to the carbon footprint. Here, the inclusion of carbon bio-capacity in addition to forest

335   land bio-capacity, in particular, may lead to double counting (Kitzes et al., 2008; Lin et al., 2016).

336   Therefore, carbon bio-capacity individually is not included among the sub-components of the bio-

337   capacity accounts. Furthermore, the built-up land cannot practically produce an ecological balance, as

338 construction available is physically built on former cropland. That is, it is assumed that the EF and BC

339 of built-up land are equal (Toderoiu, 2010; Kori, 2013; Iha et al., 2015; Lin et al., 2016). Therefore, the

340 model does not include built-up land balance accounts. Descriptive statistics of the variables included

341 in the models are presented in Table 1. Detailed information on the databases where the variables of the

342 study are obtained is given in Table 8.

343 **[Table 1 here]**

344 As can be seen from Table 1, mean values of Cropland balance, Fishing grounds balance, Forest

345 products balance, Grazing land balance and Ecological balance respectively are -0.238, 0.224, 0.417, -

346 0.257 and -4.009. In addition, correlation matrix of the dependent and independent variables is presented

347 in Table 2 and it shows that there is a statistically significant negative correlation between per capita

348 real GDP and Cropland balance, Grazing land balance and Ecological balance (-0.14, -0.47 and -0.50,

349 respectively) and statistically significant positive correlation between per capita real GDP and Fishing

350 grounds balance (0.11). On the other hand, the correlation between per capita real GDP and Forest

351 products is very small and statistically insignificant.

352 **[Table 2 here]**

353

354 *4.2. Empirical Findings*

355 This study investigates non-linear relationships between ecological balance and economic growth, and

356 between economic growth and ecological equilibrium in the areas of Cropland, Fishing Grounds, Forest

357 Products and Grazing Land as well as dependency among the cross-sections (countries).[5] It greatly

358 affects the estimation results whether taking into consideration the dependency among the cross-sections

359 making up the panel data or not (Breusch and Pagan, 1980; Pesaran, 2004). Therefore, existence of

360 cross-sectional dependency in series and in the model should be tested prior to further analysis. This

361 possibility should also be considered when selecting the unit roots in order to avoid misleading

362 estimations. Thus, this study first analyzes the cross-sectional dependency using the LM_{adj} (Adjusted

363 Lagrange Multiplier) test developed by Breusch-Pagan (1980) and further its deviation corrected by

364 Pesaran et al. (2008). The results of the LM_{adj} test together with other comparable tests are provided in

365 Table 3.

366 **[Table 3 here]**

367 As can be seen in Table 3, the null hypothesis that there is no cross-sectional dependency is strongly

368 rejected based on the test results of the series related with variables used in the models. Therefore, it is

---

[5] Model 5 is set to explain the relationship between ecological balance and economic growth while Models 1,2,3 and 4 are set to explain the relationship between economic growth and balances in Cropland, Fishing Grounds, Forest Products and Grazing Land, respectively.

369 concluded that there exists cross-sectional dependency in the series. This conclusion suggests that a
370 shock in one of the countries affects others as well. As explained above, this result requires choosing
371 appropriate test methods that take cross-sectional dependency into consideration when the methods are
372 chosen for further stages of the analysis. As a result, in the later stages of this study, Moon and Perron's
373 (2004) second generation panel unit root test, which takes the cross-sectional dependency and
374 stationarity of series into consideration is used. The results of the Moon and Perron test are provided in
375 Table 4. According to the results in Table 4, the null hypothesis claiming that the series has unit root is
376 rejected for all series. This indicates that the series are stationary at level (I(0)).

377   **[Table 4 here]**

378 Having established the stationarity of variables used in the models at level (I(0)), the next step is to
379 proceed with the first stage of PSTR analysis, that is testing the linear model against the non-linear
380 model. The results of the Wald Test (*LM*), Fisher Tests (*LM$_F$*) and LRT Tests (*LRT*) which are used to
381 test linearity in the models and also to determine the number of transition function are shown in Table
382 5.

383   **[Table 5 here]**

384 As can be seen in Table 5, the null hypothesis is rejected at the 1% significance level in models 1,4 and
385 5, and rejected at the 5% significance level in models 2 and 3 according to the *LM*, *LM$_F$* and *LRT* test
386 results. Thus, the alternative hypothesis which suggests that there is at least one non-linear threshold
387 effect in each model is accepted. Hence, it can be concluded that it is not appropriate to use linear models
388 in investigating the impact of per capita real GDP on Cropland, Fishing Grounds, Forest Products and
389 Grazing Land equilibriums and ecological balance. Once it is determined that the linear model is not
390 appropriate for all models for further analysis, the next step is to determine the appropriate number of
391 regimes. For that purpose, *LM*, *LM$_F$* and *LRT* tests are repeated for all models and the results are shown
392 in Table 6.

393   **[Table 6 here]**

394 As can be seen in Table 6, the null hypothesis that the model has one threshold effect cannot be rejected
395 for all models. Thus, it is concluded that all models have one threshold effect and the model can be
396 estimated using the PSTR approach with two regimes. In the next step, both non-linear relationships
397 between ecological balance and economic growth, and non-linear relationship between economic
398 growth and the equilibrium in each of the areas of Cropland, Fishing Grounds, Forest Products and
399 Grazing Land which determine the ecological balance are estimated using the PSRT method with two
400 regimes. The results appear in Table 7.

401 As it can be seen in Table 7, the smoothing parameter (γ) turns out to be very small for each model
402 (3.570, 16.186, 8.596, 3.809 and 26.594 respectively). The relatively small value for γ indicates that

403   switching from one regime to another is not sudden but rather smooth in the relation between per capita

404   real GDP and each equilibrium situation. This situation is demonstrated in the Figures 1 in the appendix

405   for each model.

406   **[Table 7 here]**

407   Also, as can be seen in Table 7, the threshold values for per capita real GDP for model 1 is found to be

408   \$32,565.22 (θ=10.391); for model 2, it is \$33,389.61 (θ=10.416); for model 3, it is \$53,103.60

409   (θ=10.880); for model 4, it is \$89,859.26 (θ=11.406) and for model 5 it is \$61,697.58 (θ=11.030). The

410   coefficient estimated for per capita real GDP (β_0) in the first regime where per capita real GDP is below

411   the threshold value is statistically significant and negative (-0.454) at the 5% significance level for model

412   1; it is statistically significant and negative (-0.013) at the10% significance level for model 3; it is

413   statistically significant and negative (-0.004) at the 5% significance level for model 4 and is statistically

414   significant and negative (-1.259) at the 1% level for model 5. The coefficient estimated for per capita

415   real GDP (β_0) is found to be not statistically significant for model 2. The coefficient estimated for per

416   capita real GDP ($\beta_0 + \beta_1$) in the second regime, where per capita real GDP is below the threshold value,

417   is statistically significant and positive (0.053) at the 10% significance level for model 1; it is statistically

418   significant and positive (0.023) at the 5% level for model 4 and statistically significant and positive

419   (4.915) at the 10% level for model 5. The coefficient estimated for per capita real GDP ($\beta_0 + \beta_1$) is

420   found to be not statistically significant for model 2 and 3.

421   Further interpretation of the PSTR model is as follows: In the first model, where the relationship between

422   Cropland balance and economic growth is estimated, it is found that an increase in economic growth

423   has a negative impact on Cropland balance when the per capita real GDP is below \$32,565.22 while an

424   increase in economic growth has positive impact on Cropland balance when the per capita real GDP is

425   above \$32,565.22. In model 3 where the relationship between the Forest Products balance and economic

426   growth is investigated, it is found that increase in economic growth has negative impact on Forest

427   Products balance when the per capita real GDP is below \$53,103.60 while there is no statistically

428   significant relation detected between economic growth and Forest Products balance when the per capita

429   real GDP is above \$53,103.60. In model 4 where the relationship between the Grazing Land balance

430   and economic growth is estimated, it is found that increase in economic growth has a negative impact

431   on Grazing Land balance when the per capita real GDP is below \$89,859.26 while an increase in

432   economic growth has a positive impact on Grazing Land balance when the per capita real GDP is above

433   \$89,859.26. In model 5 where the relationship between Ecological balance and economic growth is

434   estimated, it is found that increase in economic growth has negative impact on Ecological balance when

435   the per capita real GDP is below \$61,697.58 while an increase in economic growth has a positive impact

436   on Ecological balance when the per capita real GDP is above \$61,697.58. However, PSTR model

437   findings indicate no significant relation between economic growth and Fishing Grounds balance. In

addition, when the coefficients are analyzed in terms of their magnitude, the impact of economic growth on Ecological balance is greater than the impact of economic growth on Cropland balance, Fishing Grounds balance, Forest Products balance and Grazing Land balance.

The estimated coefficients for control variables that may possibly affect the equilibrium situation in each model such as age dependency ratio, urbanization ratio and energy consumption are given in Table 7. In model 1 where the relationship between the Cropland balance and economic growth is estimated, it is found that an increase in the urbanization ratio and energy consumption has a positive impact on Cropland balance (coefficients are 0,038 and 0,019, respectively) when the per capita real GDP is below $32,565.22 while it has a negative impact on Cropland balance (coefficients are -0,029 and -0,016 respectively) when the per capita real GDP is above $32,565.22. Age dependency ratio is found to be not significant on Cropland balance.

In model 2, in which the relationship between Fishing Grounds balance and economic growth is estimated, it is found that an increase in age dependency ratio and energy consumption has a positive impact on Fishing Grounds balance (coefficients are 0.011 and 0.004 respectively) while an increase in urbanization ratio has negative impact on Fishing Grounds balance (-0,006) when the per capita real GDP is below $33,389.61. On the other hand, when the per capita real GDP is above $33,389.61, an increase in age dependency ratio has positive impact on Fishing Grounds balance (0,001) while an increase in urbanization rate has negative impact on Fishing Grounds balance (-0,001). Energy Consumption is found to be not significant on Fishing Grounds balance when the per capita real GDP is above $33,389.61.

In model 3 where the relationship between Forest Products balance and economic growth is estimated, it is found that an increase in age dependency ratio has positive impact on Forest Products balance (0,020) while there is no significant relationship detected between energy consumption and Forest Products balance or between urbanization ratio and Forest Products balance when the per capita real GDP is below $53,103.60. Furthermore, when the per capita real GDP is above $53,103.60, none of the control variables are found to be significant on Forest Products balance.

In model 4 where the relationship between Grazing Land balance and economic growth is estimated, it is found that an increase in age dependency ratio has positive impact on Grazing Land balance (0,015) while increase in urbanization ratio has negative impact on Grazing Land balance (-0,011) when the per capita real GDP is below $89,859.26. On the other hand, when the per capita real GDP is above $89,859.26, an increase in age dependency ratio has negative impact on Grazing Land balance (-0,043) while an increase in urbanization rate has positive impact on Grazing Land balance (0,013). Energy Consumption is found to be not significant on Grazing Land balance in both regimes.

In model 5 where the relationship between Ecological balance and economic growth is estimated, it is found that an increase in age dependency ratio has a positive impact on Ecological balance (0,146) when

the per capita real GDP is below $61,697.58. However, when the per capita real GDP is above $61,697.58, an increase in age dependency ratio has negative impact on Ecological balance (-0,629) Energy Consumption and urbanization rate are found to be not significant on Ecological balance in both regimes.

5. Conclusion

This study provides new empirical evidence on the ecological effects of economic activities in terms of ecological balance calculations, taking account of the main criticisms of the EKC hypothesis and its policy implications in the literature. The study empirically investigates effects of per capita income on the ecological balance sheet—namely, total ecological balance, cropland balance, grazing land balance, forest area balance, and fishing grounds balance- and analyzes whether the relationship can exhibit the inverted U-curve of the EKC path. The sample of this study consists of 13 EU countries observed for the period 1995-2016. To examine the impact of per capita real GDP on ecological balance sheets, this study uses the Panel STR approach that can endogenously estimate the turning point while also allowing parameters to change smoothly from one regime to another.

The empirical findings confirm that there is a non-linear link between per capita income and total ecological balance and its main components; cropland balance, grazing land balance, forest area balance, and fishing grounds balance. However, this study found no evidence to support the existence of the inverted U-shape EKC pattern for both total ecological balance sheet and its sub-components.

The results from the PSTR model indicate that as the amount of goods and services produced per capita increases, the process initially improves the total ecological balance, cropland balance and grazing land balance and after above per capita income levels of approximately $61.697, $32.565 and $89.859, respectively, environmental degradation occurs smoothly. These findings indicate that above a certain threshold level, nature is strongly polluted by human activities and cannot absorb this pollution at this rate, which exceeds its regenerative capacity. In other words, a higher production of goods and services results in a higher ecological erosion for grazing land, cropland, and total land.

Secondly, the findings obtained for forest area balance and fishing grounds balance differ. According to these results, there is a sustainable structure for the forest area up to the per capita income threshold of $53,103 but this statistical relationship deteriorates once this threshold level is surpassed, that is, the results become statistically insignificant. In addition, the effects of per capita income on fishing grounds balance are statistically insignificant both below and above the threshold of $33,389. The insignificance of the relationship between per capita real GDP and fishing grounds balance may be due to the expansion of aquaculture alongside traditional fishing activities in the last few decades. It is known that the importance of aquaculture increases in meeting the protein needs of the rapidly increasing population worldwide, as natural stocks gradually decrease. Based on FAO's (2020) data, as of 2018, aquaculture supplies about 46% (82.1 million tons) of total seafood production and about 52% of fish for human

508 consumption. Despite these findings, it is not clear that aquaculture is beneficial on balance. It is argued
509 that aquaculture, which has made critical contributions to protection of biodiversity and food security as
510 well as limiting overfishing, has a number of detrimental effects on the environment. Therefore,
511 changing a negative activity such as overfishing with a solution like aquaculture that could potentially
512 cause a different range of problems might not be the right step. The transition from traditional fishing to
513 aquaculture may have an unexpected impact on the nexus between per capita real GDP and fishing
514 grounds variables.

515 Finally, the findings of this study suggest that, for countries with per capita real GDP levels higher than
516 the critical threshold, governments should consider limiting the ecologically damaging economic
517 activities or imposing regulations to modify how they are conducted in order to reduce the ecological
518 damage.

526 **Availability of data and materials** The data sets supporting the results of this article are included within
527 the article and its additional files.

528 **Declarations**

529 **Ethics approval and consent to participate** Not applicable.

530 **Consent for publication** Written informed consent for publication was obtained from all participants.

531 **Conflict of interests** The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

532 **References**

533 Agras, J., & Chapman, D. (1999). A dynamic approach to the Environmental Kuznets Curve
534   hypothesis. *Ecological Economics*, *28*(2), 267-277. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0921-8009(98)00040-8

535 Ahmad, N., Du, L., Lu, J., Wang, J., Li, H. Z., & Hashmi, M. Z. (2017). Modelling the CO_2 emissions
536   and economic growth in Croatia: Is there any environmental Kuznets curve?. *Energy*, *123*, 164-172.
537   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2016.12.106

538   Al-Mulali, U., Weng-Wai, C., Sheau-Ting, L., & Mohammed, A. H. (2015). Investigating the
539   environmental Kuznets curve (EKC) hypothesis by utilizing the ecological footprint as an indicator
540   of environmental degradation. *Ecological Indicators*, *48*, 315-323.
541   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2014.08.029

542   Akbostanci, E., Turut-Asik, S., & Tunc, G. I. (2009). The relationship between income and environment
543   in Turkey: is there an environmental Kuznets curve?. *Energy policy*, *37*(3), 861-867.
544   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2008.09.088

545   Apergis, N. (2016). Environmental Kuznets curves: New evidence on both panel and country-level CO2
546   emissions. *Energy Economics*, *54*, 263-271.

547   Apergis, N., & Ozturk, I. (2015). Testing environmental Kuznets curve hypothesis in Asian
548   countries. *Ecological Indicators*, *52*, 16-22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2014.11.026

549   Arrow, K., Bolin, B., Costanza, R., Dasgupta, P., Folke, C., Holling, C. S., ... & Pimentel, D. (1995).
550   Economic growth, carrying capacity, and the environment. *Ecological economics*, *15*(2), 91-95.
551   https://doi.org/10.1016/0921-8009(95)00059-3

552   Asafu-Adjaye, J. (2003). Biodiversity loss and economic growth: a cross-country
553   analysis. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, *21*(2), 173-185. https://doi.org/10.1093/cep/byg003

554   Aşıcı, A. A., & Acar, S. (2016). Does income growth relocate ecological footprint?. *Ecological
555   Indicators*, *61*, 707-714. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2015.10.022

556   Aydin, C., Esen, Ö., & Aydin, R. (2019). Is the ecological footprint related to the Kuznets curve a real
557   process or rationalizing the ecological consequences of the affluence? Evidence from PSTR
558   approach. *Ecological indicators*, *98*, 543-555. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2018.11.034

559   Azlina, A. A., Law, S. H., & Mustapha, N. H. N. (2014). Dynamic linkages among transport energy
560   consumption, income and CO_2 emission in Malaysia. *Energy Policy*, *73*, 598-606.
561   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2014.05.046

562   Baek, J. (2015). Environmental Kuznets curve for CO_2 emissions: the case of Arctic countries. *Energy
563   Economics*, *50*, 13-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2015.04.010

564   Bagliani, M., Bravo, G., & Dalmazzone, S. (2008). A consumption-based approach to environmental
565   Kuznets curves using the ecological footprint indicator. *Ecological Economics*, *65*(3), 650-661.

566   Balaguer, J., & Cantavella, M. (2016). Estimating the environmental Kuznets curve for Spain by
567   considering fuel oil prices (1874–2011). *Ecological Indicators*, *60*, 853-859.
568   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2015.08.006

569   Beckerman, W. (1992). Economic growth and the environment: Whose growth? Whose
570   environment?. *World development*, *20*(4), 481-496.

571 Beckerman, W. (1992). Economic growth and the environment: Whose growth? Whose
572   environment?. *World development*, *20*(4), 481-496. https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(92)90038-
573   W

574 Bhattarai, M., & Hammig, M. (2001). Institutions and the environmental Kuznets curve for
575   deforestation: a crosscountry analysis for Latin America, Africa and Asia. *World development*, *29*(6),
576   995-1010. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(01)00019-5

577 Bimonte, S. (2002). Information access, income distribution, and the Environmental Kuznets
578   Curve. *Ecological economics*, *41*(1), 145-156. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0921-8009(02)00022-8

579 Breusch, T.S., Pagan, A.R., 1980. The Lagrange multiplier test and its applications to model
580   specification in econometrics. Rev. Econ. Stud. 47 (1), 239–253.

581 Caviglia-Harris, J. L., Chambers, D., & Kahn, J. R. (2009). Taking the "U" out of Kuznets: A
582   comprehensive analysis of the EKC and environmental degradation. *Ecological Economics*, *68*(4),
583   1149-1159.

584 Cavlovic, T. A., Baker, K. H., Berrens, R. P., & Gawande, K. (2000). A meta-analysis of environmental
585   Kuznets curve studies. *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review*, *29*(1), 32-42.

586 Charfeddine, L., & Mrabet, Z. (2017). The impact of economic development and social-political factors
587   on ecological footprint: A panel data analysis for 15 MENA countries. *Renewable and Sustainable*
588   *Energy Reviews*, *76*, 138-154.

589 Chiu, Y. B. (2012). Deforestation and the environmental Kuznets curve in developing countries: A panel
590   smooth transition regression approach. *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics/Revue*
591   *canadienne d'agroeconomie*, *60*(2), 177-194.

592 Clark, R. (1994). Cumulative effects assessment: a tool for sustainable development. Impact
593   Assessment, 12(3), 319-331. https://doi.org/10.1080/07349165.1994.9725869

594 Cole, M. A. (2003). Development, trade, and the environment: how robust is the Environmental Kuznets
595   Curve?. *Environment and Development Economics*, *8*(4), 557-580.
596   https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355770X0300305

597 Cooper, L. M. (2004). Guidelines for Cumulative Effects Assessment in SEA of Plans: EPMG
598   Occasional Paper 04/LMC/CEA. London: Imperial College London.

599 Czech, B. (2008). Prospects for reconciling the conflict between economic growth and biodiversity
600   conservation with technological progress. *Conservation Biology*, *22*(6), 1389-1398.

601 Destek, M. A., & Sarkodie, S. A. (2019). Investigation of environmental Kuznets curve for ecological
602   footprint: the role of energy and financial development. *Science of the Total Environment*, *650*, 2483-
603   2489.

Destek, M. A., Ulucak, R., & Dogan, E. (2018). Analyzing the environmental Kuznets curve for the EU countries: the role of ecological footprint. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *25*(29), 29387-29396.

Dietz, S., & Adger, W. N. (2003). Economic growth, biodiversity loss and conservation effort. *Journal of environmental management*, *68*(1), 23-35.

Dogan, E., & Inglesi-Lotz, R. (2020). The impact of economic structure to the environmental Kuznets curve (EKC) hypothesis: evidence from European countries. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *27*(11), 12717-12724. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-020-07878-2

Esen, Ö., Yıldırım, D. Ç., & Yıldırım, S. (2020). Threshold effects of economic growth on water stress in the Eurozone. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 27, 31427–31438. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-020-09383-y

Esteve, V., & Tamarit, C. (2012). Threshold cointegration and nonlinear adjustment between CO2 and income: the environmental Kuznets curve in Spain, 1857–2007. *Energy Economics*, *34*(6), 2148-2156.

European Commission (1995). *White paper: An energy policy for the European Union*. Brussels: EU Law and Publications.

FAO (2020). *The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2020*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (Accessed on 19.02.2021), http://www.fao.org/3/ca9229en/CA9229EN.pdf

Fodha, M., & Zaghdoud, O. (2010). Economic growth and pollutant emissions in Tunisia: an empirical analysis of the environmental Kuznets curve. *Energy Policy*, *38*(2), 1150-1156. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2009.11.002

Fouquau, J., Hurlin, C., Rabaud, I., 2008. The Feldstein-Horioka puzzle: a panel smooth transition regression approach. Econ. Model. 25, 284–299.

Galeotti, M., Manera, M., & Lanza, A. (2009). On the robustness of robustness checks of the environmental Kuznets curve hypothesis. *Environmental and Resource Economics*, *42*(4), 551–574. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-008-9224-x

González, A., Teräsvirta, T., & van Dijk, D. (2005). *Panel smooth transition regression models*. SSE/EFI Working Paper Series in Economics and Finance, WP No. 604.

Grossman, G. M., & Krueger, A. B. (1991). *Environmental Impacts of a North American Free Trade Agreement.* NBER Working Papers, WP. No: 3914.

Grossman, G. M., & Krueger, A. B. (1995). Economic Growth and the Environment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 110(2), 353-377. https://doi.org/10.2307/2118443

Güloğlu, B., Nazlıoğlu, Ş., 2013. Enflasyonun Tarımsal Fiyatlar Üzerindeki Etkileri: Panel Yumuşak Geçiş Regresyon Analizi. Siyaset, Ekonomi ve Yönetim Dergisi 1 (1), 1–20.

He, J., & Richard, P. (2010). Environmental Kuznets curve for CO2 in Canada. *Ecological Economics*, *69*(5), 1083-1093.

Hervieux, M. S., & Darné, O. (2015). Environmental Kuznets curve and ecological footprint: a time series analysis. *Economics Bulletin*, *35*(1), 814-826.

Holtz–Eakin, D., & Selden, T. (1995). Stoking the fires? CO2 emissions and economic growth. *Journal of Public Economics*, *57*(1), 85-101. https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2727(94)01449-X

Iha, K., Poblete, P., Panda, D., & Sebastian, W. (2015). A Footprint Analysis of ASEAN: Ensuring Sustainable Development in an Increasingly Resource Constrained World. *Asian Biotechnology & Development Review*, *17*(2), 57-67.

Imamoglu, H. (2018). Is the informal economic activity a determinant of environmental quality?. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *25*(29), 29078-29088.

Iritié, B. G. J. J. (2015). Economic growth and biodiversity: An overview. Conservation policies in Africa. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, *8*(2), 196-208.

Iwata, H., Okada, K., & Samreth, S. (2010). Empirical study on the environmental Kuznets curve for CO_2 in France: the role of nuclear energy. *Energy Policy*, *38*(8), 4057-4063. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2010.03.031

Jalil, A., & Mahmud, S. F. (2009). Environment Kuznets curve for CO_2 emissions: a cointegration analysis for China. *Energy Policy*, *37*(12), 5167-5172. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2009.07.044

Jebli, M. B., Youssef, S. B., & Ozturk, I. (2016). Testing environmental Kuznets curve hypothesis: The role of renewable and non-renewable energy consumption and trade in OECD countries. *Ecological Indicators*, *60*, 824-831. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2015.08.031

Kahuthu, A. (2006). Economic growth and environmental degradation in a global context. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, *8*(1), 55-68. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-005-0785-3

Katz, D. (2015). Water use and economic growth: reconsidering the Environmental Kuznets Curve relationship. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *88*, 205-213. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.08.017

Kearsley, A., & Riddel, M. (2010). A further inquiry into the Pollution Haven Hypothesis and the Environmental Kuznets Curve. *Ecological Economics*, *69*(4), 905-919. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2009.11.014

Kitzes, J., Galli, A., Rizk, S. M., Reed, A., & Wackernagel, M. (2008). *Guidebook to the national footprint accounts.* Oakland: Global Footprint Network.

670 Li, T., Wang, Y., & Zhao, D. (2016). Environmental Kuznets curve in China: new evidence from
671   dynamic panel analysis. *Energy Policy*, *91*, 138-147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2016.01.002

672 Lieb, C. M. (2003). *The environmental Kuznets curve: a survey of the empirical evidence and of possible*
673   *causes* (No. 391). Discussion paper series, No. 391. Heidelberg: University of Heidelberg,
674   Department of Economics.

675 Lin, D., Hanscom, L., Martindill, J., Borucke, M., Cohen, L., Galli, A., Lazarus, E., Zokai, G., Iha, K.,
676   Eaton, D., & Wackernagel, M. (2016). *Working Guidebook to the National footprint*
677   *accounts.* Oakland: Global Footprint Network.

678 List, J. A., & Gallet, C. A. (1999). The environmental Kuznets curve: does one size fit all?. *Ecological*
679   *economics*, *31*(3), 409-423. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0921-8009(99)00064-6

680 Liu, X., Zhang, S., & Bae, J. (2017). The impact of renewable energy and agriculture on carbon dioxide
681   emissions: Investigating the environmental Kuznets curve in four selected ASEAN
682   countries. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *164*, 1239-1247.
683   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.07.086

684 Luo, G., Weng, J. H., Zhang, Q., & Hao, Y. (2017). A reexamination of the existence of environmental
685   Kuznets curve for CO_2 emissions: evidence from G20 countries. *Natural Hazards*, *85*(2), 1023-1042.
686   https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-016-2618-0

687 Luzzati, T., & Orsini, M. (2009). Investigating the energy-environmental Kuznets curve. *Energy*, *34*(3),
688   291-300. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2008.07.006

689 Meadows, D. H., Meadows, D. L., Randers, J., & Behrens, W. W. (1972). *The limits to growth.* New
690   York: Universe Books.

691 Mills, J. H., & Waite, T. A. (2009). Economic prosperity, biodiversity conservation, and the
692   environmental Kuznets curve. Ecological Economics, 68(7), 2087-2095.

693 Moon, H.R., Perron, B., 2004. Testing for a unit root in panels with dynamic factors. J. Econometrics
694   122 (1), 81–126.

695 Moutinho, V., Varum, C., & Madaleno, M. (2017). How economic growth affects emissions? An
696   investigation of the environmental Kuznets curve in Portuguese and Spanish economic activity
697   sectors. *Energy Policy*, *106*, 326-344. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2017.03.069

698 Mrabet, Z., & Alsamara, M. (2017). Testing the Kuznets Curve hypothesis for Qatar: A comparison
699   between carbon dioxide and ecological footprint. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *70*,
700   1366-1375.

Nasir, M., & Rehman, F. U. (2011). Environmental Kuznets curve for carbon emissions in Pakistan: an empirical investigation. *Energy Policy*, *39*(3), 1857-1864. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2011.01.025

Özsoy, C. E., & Dinç, A. (2016). Sustainable Development and Ecological Footprint. Finans Politik & Ekonomik Yorumlar, 53(619), 35.

Ozturk, I., & Acaravci, A. (2010). CO_2 emissions, energy consumption and economic growth in Turkey. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *14*(9), 3220-3225. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2010.07.005

Ozturk, I., & Al-Mulali, U. (2015). Investigating the validity of the environmental Kuznets curve hypothesis in Cambodia. *Ecological Indicators*, *57*, 324-330. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2015.05.018

Panayotou, T. (1993). *Empirical tests and policy analysis of environmental degradation at different stages of economic development.* WP. No: 238, Technology and Employment Programme, International Labour Organization, Geneva.

Panayotou, T. (1997). Demystifying the environmental Kuznets curve: turning a black box into a policy tool. *Environment and development economics*, 465-484.

Pao, H. T., Yu, H. C., & Yang, Y. H. (2011). Modeling the CO_2 emissions, energy use, and economic growth in Russia. *Energy*, *36*(8), 5094-5100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2011.06.004

Paolo Miglietta, P., De Leo, F., & Toma, P. (2017). Environmental Kuznets curve and the water footprint: An empirical analysis. *Water and Environment Journal*, *31*(1), 20-30.

Pesaran, 2004. M.H. Pesaran General Diagnostic Tests for Cross Section Dependence in Panels. CESifo Working No. 1229.

Pesaran, M.H., Ullah, A., Yamagata, T., 2008. A bias-adjusted LM test of error crosssection independence. Econometrics J. 11 (1), 105–127.

Rees, W. E. (1992). Ecological footprints and appropriated carrying capacity: what urban economics leaves out. *Environment and urbanization*, *4*(2), 121-130. https://doi.org/10.1177/095624789200400212

Rees, W. E., & Wackernagel, M. (1994). Ecological footprints and appropriated carrying capacity: measuring the natural capital requirements of the human economy. In: *Investing in Natural Capital: The Ecological Economics Approach to Sustainability,* A.-M. Jansson, M. Hammer, C. Folke, R. Costanza (Eds.), pp. 362-390, Washington, DC: Island Press.

732   Richmond, A. K., & Kaufmann, R. K. (2006). Is there a turning point in the relationship between income
733   and energy use and/or carbon emissions?. *Ecological economics*, *56*(2), 176-189.
734   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2005.01.011

735   Robalino-López, A., Mena-Nieto, Á., García-Ramos, J. E., & Golpe, A. A. (2015). Studying the
736   relationship between economic growth, CO_2 emissions, and the environmental Kuznets curve in
737   Venezuela (1980–2025). *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *41*, 602-614.
738   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2014.08.081

739   Romero-Ávila, D. (2008). Questioning the empirical basis of the environmental Kuznets curve for CO2:
740   new evidence from a panel stationarity test robust to multiple breaks and cross-
741   dependence. *Ecological Economics*, *64*(3), 559-574. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2007.03.011

742   Rugani, B., Roviani, D., Hild, P., Schmitt, B., & Benetto, E. (2014). Ecological deficit and use of natural
743   capital in Luxembourg from 1995 to 2009. *Science of the total environment*, *468*, 292-301.

744   Ruiz–Agudelo, C. A., Sánchez Pérez, G., Sáenz, J. E., & Higuera Cárdenas, L. A. (2019). Biodiversity
745   and growth in Colombia, 1995–2015: an approach from the environmental kuznets
746   hypothesis. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy*, *8*(1), 17-31.

747   Saboori, B., Sulaiman, J., & Mohd, S. (2012). Economic growth and CO_2 emissions in Malaysia: a
748   cointegration analysis of the environmental Kuznets curve. *Energy Policy*, 51, 184-191.
749   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2012.08.065

750   Salvati, L., & Zitti, M. (2008). Natural resource depletion and the economic performance of local
751   districts: suggestions from a within-country analysis. *The International Journal of Sustainable
752   Development & World Ecology*, *15*(6), 518-523.

753   Schaefer, F., Luksch, U., Steinbach, N., Cabeça, J., & Hanauer, J. (2006). *Ecological Footprint and
754   Biocapacity: The world's ability to regenerate resources and absorb waste in a limited time
755   period.* Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

756   Selden, T. M., & Song, D. (1994). Environmental quality and development: is there a Kuznets curve for
757   air pollution emissions?. *Journal of Environmental Economics and management*, 27(2), 147-162.
758   https://doi.org/10.1006/jeem.1994.1031

759   Shafik, N., & Bandyopadhyay, S. (1992). *Economic Growth and Environmental Quality: Time-Series
760   and Cross-Country Evidence.* Policy Research Working Paper Series, WP. No. 904, Washington,
761   DC: World Bank Publications.

762   Shahbaz, M., Ozturk, I., Afza, T., & Ali, A. (2013). Revisiting the environmental Kuznets curve in a
763   global economy. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *25*, 494-502.
764   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2013.05.021

Shahbaz, M., Sbia, R., Hamdi, H., & Ozturk, I. (2014). Economic growth, electricity consumption, urbanization and environmental degradation relationship in United Arab Emirates. *Ecological Indicators*, *45*, 622-631. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2014.05.022

Simpson, R., Toman, M., & Ayres, R. U. (2005). Introduction: The "New Scarcity". In: Simpson, R., Toman, M., & Ayres, R. U. (Eds.), *Scarcity and Growth Revisited Natural Resources and the Environment in the New Millennium*, (p 1-32). *Washington, DC.*: Resources For The Future

Solarin, S.A., Al-Mulali, U., & Ozturk, I. (2017). Validating the environmental Kuznets curve hypothesis in India and China: The role of hydroelectricity consumption. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *80*, 1578-1587. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.07.028

Solomon, G. M., Morello-Frosch, R., Zeise, L., & Faust, J. B. (2016). Cumulative environmental impacts: Science and policy to protect communities. *Annual review of public health*, *37*, 83-96. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-032315-021807

Stern, D. I. (1998). Progress on the environmental Kuznets curve?. *Environment and development economics*, *3*(2), 173-196.

Stern, D.I., Common, M. S., & Barbier, E. B. (1996). Economic growth and environmental degradation: the environmental Kuznets curve and sustainable development. *World development*, *24*(7), 1151-1160. https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(96)00032-0

Tao, S., Zheng, T., & Lianjun, T. (2008). An empirical test of the environmental Kuznets curve in China: a panel cointegration approach. *China Economic Review*, *19*(3), 381-392. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chieco.2007.10.001

Tisdell, C. (2000). Free trade, globalisation, and environment and sustainability: major positions and theposition of WTO. Economics, Ecology and the Environment Working Paper 39. Brisbane: The University of Queensland.

Tisdell, C.A. (2001). Globalisation and sustainability: environmental Kuznets curve and the WTO. *Ecological Economics*, *39*(2), 185-196. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0921-8009(01)00234-8

Tisdell, C. A. (2002). The economics of conserving wildlife and natural areas. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Toderoiu, F. (2010). Ecological footprint and biocapacity–Methodology and regional and national dimensions. *Agricultural Economics and Rural Development*, 7(*2*), 213-238.

Uddin, G. A., Alam, K., & Gow, J. (2016). Does ecological footprint impede economic growth? An empirical analysis based on the environmental Kuznets curve hypothesis. *Australian Economic Papers*, *55*(3), 301-316.

797 Uddin, G.A., Salahuddin, M., Alam, K., Gow, J., 2017. Ecological footprint and real income: panel data
798   evidence from the 27 highest emitting countries. Ecol. Ind. 77, 166–175.

799 Wackernagel, M., & Rees, W.(1996). *Our Ecological Footprint, Reducing Human Impact on the Earth*.
800   Gabriola Island, Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.

801 Wackernagel, M., White, S., & Moran, D. (2004). Using Ecological Footprint accounts: from analysis
802   to applications. *International Journal of Environment and Sustainable Development*, *3*(3-4), 293-
803   315.

804 Wang, Y., Han, R., & Kubota, J. (2016). Is there an environmental Kuznets curve for SO_2 emissions? A
805   semi-parametric panel data analysis for China. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *54*,
806   1182-1188. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.10.143

807 Wang, Y., Kang, L., Wu, X., & Xiao, Y. (2013). Estimating the environmental Kuznets curve for
808   ecological footprint at the global level: A spatial econometric approach. *Ecological indicators*, *34*,
809   15-21.

810 Wu, P. C., Liu, S. Y., & Pan, S. C. (2013). Nonlinear bilateral trade balance-fundamentals nexus: A
811   panel smooth transition regression approach. *International review of economics & finance*, *27*, 318-
812   329.

813 York, R., Rosa, E. A., & Dietz, T. (2003). Footprints on the earth: The environmental consequences of
814   modernity. *American sociological review*, 68(2), 279-300.

815 York, R., Rosa, E. A., & Dietz, T. (2004). The ecological footprint intensity of national
816   economies. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, *8*(4), 139-154.

817 Zoundi, Z. (2017). CO2 emissions, renewable energy and the Environmental Kuznets Curve, a panel
818   cointegration approach. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *72*, 1067-1075.
819   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2016.10.018

820 **Appendix**

821   [Table 8 here]

822   [Figure 1 here]

823

Figures

Figure 1

Estimated transition function of the PSTR model against real GDP per capita for all models

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- Table5.jpg
- Table6.jpg
- Data.xlsx
- ResponsetoReviewerEditorCommentsandTurnitin.pdf