

Espoir, Delphin Kamanda; Mudiangombe, Benjamin; Bannor, Frank; Sunge, Regret; Mubenga Tshitaka, Jean-Luc

Working Paper

CO₂ emissions and economic growth: Assessing the heterogeneous effects across climate regimes in Africa

Suggested Citation: Espoir, Delphin Kamanda; Mudiangombe, Benjamin; Bannor, Frank; Sunge, Regret; Mubenga Tshitaka, Jean-Luc (2021) : CO₂ emissions and economic growth: Assessing the heterogeneous effects across climate regimes in Africa, ZBW - Leibniz Information Centre for Economics, Kiel, Hamburg

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/235479>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.


You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Co2 emissions and economic growth: Assessing the heterogeneous effects across climate regimes in Africa

Delphin Kamanda Espoir¹; Benjamin Mudiangombe¹; Frank Bannor¹; Regret Sunge²; and Jean-Luc Mubenga Tshitaka¹

Graphical abstract



Abstract

Climate change has occasioned several Earth long-term events, including extreme temperatures. In recent years, Africa was reported as part of the world's regions that experienced extreme temperatures above pre-industrial levels. Despite lower contribution to Green House Gas (GHG) emissions and global warming, Africa remains among the world regions that suffer the most from climate change. However, the impact of climatic factors of temperature and emissions on economic production in Africa has not been broadly investigated, specifically among climate regimes. In this study, we attempt for the first time to understand the heterogeneous impacts of emissions and temperature on income in Africa using panel and time-series techniques on datasets spanning the years 1995-2016. At the global level in Africa, our empirical results reveal that a 1% increase in average temperature reduces income by 1.08%, whereas a 1% rise in Co2 emissions spurs income by 0.23%. The emissions effect result implies that environmental policies specifically designed to reduce Co2 emissions in Africa as a whole may significantly impact production in the long run. Also, the result suggests that a shift from optimal temperature levels to extreme patterns deter economic growth. Despite these revelations, our extended analysis based on climate regimes indicates heterogeneous effects across countries. Considering the Paris agreement on climate, this study suggests that policymakers should emphasise country-specific policies than global climatic policies for sustained Co2 emissions reduction in Africa.

Keywords: Heterogeneous effects, Temperature, Climate change, Environmental sustainability, Panel data, time-series data

JEL: C32, C33, Q54

Introduction

Across the globe, and in every aspect of life, it is becoming increasingly difficult to ignore the causes and consequences of climate change. Most notably, climate change is responsible for the decrease in agricultural production and worsening food insecurity (Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), 2019), more disease morbidity (World Health Organization (WHO), 2018), and increasing poverty

¹ School of Economics, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa. Corresponding author: Delphin Kamanda Espoir, email: espoirkamandadelphin@gmail.com. (B. Mudiangombe), benmudang@gmail.com (F. Bannor), frankybannor@hotmail.com (JL.M. Tshitaka), jeanlucmubenga@yahoo.fr

² Department of Economics, Munhumutapa School of Commerce, Great Zimbabwe University, email: rsunge@gzu.ac.zw

(Hallegatte et al., 2016). Ultimately, climate change is the main impediment to economic growth and development (International Monetary Fund (IMF), 2017, 2019; The Economist Intelligence Unit, 2020). Ironically, the most affected sectors of the economy, particularly agriculture and manufacturing, are the main contributors to climate change. Energy consumption, driven by agriculture and industrial processes, accounts for 73% of greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) (World Resources Institute, 2020). Thus, the most significant intermediate impact of GHGs is global warming.

The world has been experiencing rising temperatures over the past 40 years. The past six years have been the warmest. 2016 and 2020 are the hottest, recording 1.29 °C (2.33 °F) and 1.27 °C (2.29°F) higher than the pre-industrial period (1850-1900) respectively (World Meteorological Organization (WMO), 2020). In Africa, the temperature rise has been slightly faster than global average levels (WMO, 2020). The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) predicts that Africa will record temperatures 2 °C above the pre-industrial levels by 2080 (IPCC, 2015). Accordingly, Africa is expected to be hit hardest by the effects of global warming. The Economist Intelligence Unit (2020) projects that while the global economy may lose close to 3% of GDP by 2050, Africa may lose up to 4.7%. According to the African Climate Policy Centre (ACPC) (2020), the impact will be heterogeneous according to regions, climatic regimes, and temperature projections, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Projected Climate Change impact on Africa's GDP (annual %) under four temperature regimes

Sub-Region	Annual GDP (%) change			
	1°C	2°C	3°C	4°C
North (7)	-0.76 +/-0.16	-1.63 +/-0.36	-2.72 +/-0.61	-4.11 +/-0.97
West (15)	-4.46 +/-0.63	-9.79 +/-1.35	-15.62 +/-2.08	-22.09 +/-2.78
Central (9)	-1.17 +/-0.45	-2.82 +/-1.10	-5.53 +/-1.56	-9.13 +/-2.16
East (14)	-2.01 +/-0.20	-4.51 +/-0.34	-7.55 +/-0.63	-11.16 +/-0.85
Southern (10)	-1.18 +/-0.64	-2.68 +/-1.54	-4.40 +/-2.56	-6.49 +/-3.75
Africa (55)	-2.25 +/-1.52	-5.01 +/-3.30	-8.28 +/-5.62	-12.12 +/-7.04

Source: African Climate Policy Centre (ACPC) (2020) obtained from <https://unfccc.int/news/climate-change-is-an-increasing-threat-to-africa>. Accessed June 2021.

We can see from Table 1 that under the same temperature change projections, the impact on GDP varies according to regions. As a whole, Africa's GDP will shrink by between 2.25% and 12.12% for temperature changes of 1°C and 4°C, respectively. The western region is expected to be the hardest hit, with its GDP change forecasted between -4.46% and -22.09% for the same temperature projections. The impact will be mostly negligible in the northern region, which may register -4.11% growth under the worst, yet most unlikely temperature level of 4°C. This variation reflects the different climatic conditions in the continent. The IPCC (2015) forecasts that the Sahel and Southern Africa regions will be drier, have more frequent heat waves, and experience more frequent drought. Central Africa will experience a reduction in wet spells length. Elsewhere, West Africa will see the number of dry days increasing. The African continent can be classified into six climatic regimes, as shown in Figure 1. The probable heterogeneous impact of climate change and temperature on economic growth can be seen in Figure 2.

Over the period 1995-2016, the WTM region experienced the most significant increase in temperature (0.22%) and recorded the least growth in GDP per capita (3.17%). However, STM, the region with the slightest temperature increase (0.07%), is not the one with the biggest growth in GDP per capita

(4.88%). On the contrary, TM documented the highest growth in GDP per capita (5.86%) despite recording a sizable increase in temperature (0.18%).




Figure 1: Map of African countries and their corresponding climate regime.
Source: Authors’ self-painting using World Development Indicators online database, World Bank (2021) and Encyclopedia Britannica (2021), World Climate Regions online map, accessed in June 2021.

The varied impact of climate change can also be noted from the Co2 emissions and economic development nexus. We observe that the three regions (STM, TDR, and TM) with the biggest increase in Co2 emissions per capita (1.29%; 3.61%; 5.88%) also have the highest growth rates in GDP per capita (4.88%; 4.95%; 5.86%). For these climatic regimes, economic growth is strongly correlated with Co2 emissions. This may be due to increasing energy consumption. In the STD region, growth in Co2 per capita is negative (-1.29%), yet its growth in GDP per capita (3.55%) is higher than that of WTM (3.17%).




Figure 2. Average growths rates in GDP per capita, Co2 emissions, and temperature across climate regimes
Source: Authors’ compilation based on World Bank data.

Despite the existence of different climate regimes in Africa, existing studies on the nexus between climate change and economic growth (Abid, 2016; Chekouri et al., 2021; Espoir & Sunge, 2021; Olubusoye & Musa, 2020; Omotor, 2016; Yusuf et al., 2020) have ignored the heterogeneous effects of climate regimes and indeed temperature variations. Attempts to account for specific conditions are restricted to the country's levels of development (Olubusoye & Musa, 2020), oil-producing countries (Yusuf et al., 2020), and geographical regions (Demissew Beyene & Kotosz, 2020; Omotor, 2016). These studies implicitly assume the homogeneity of climate regimes and temperature conditions. Elsewhere, evidence has shown that temperature matters. Studies by Akram (2013), Dell et al. (2012), Holtermann & Rische (2020), Kahn et al. (2019), Kalkuhl & Wenz (2018), and Newell et al. (2018) have shown that economic growth tends to be lower for hotter and poorer countries or regions. A few studies (Abidoye & Odusola, 2015; Baarsch et al., 2020; Lanzafame, 2012; Odusola & Abidoye, 2017) have acknowledged the impact of temperature on economic growth in Africa.

While studies enumerated above have provided important evidence, we observe that temperature change effects on the interaction and co-movement between Co2 emissions and economic growth have not been dealt with clearly. There are conflicting results attributed to differences in data sources, country-specific characteristics, variables selection, and econometric strategies. Moreover, the effect of climate change regime has been sidelined. As a result, such studies turn a blind eye to the reality of the heterogeneous effects of climate variables, particularly temperature changes on the co-movement or absence of, between these variables of interest. Understandably, analysing the interaction effects of variables is difficult to compute and interpret from conventional estimation techniques.

This study investigates the effects of Co2 emissions and temperature on economic growth across climate regimes using various econometric techniques while considering Africa as a case scenario. The African case is appealing for developing policy alternatives for countries with similar climate-dependent characteristics. To capture the heterogeneous effects based on climate regime criterium, we utilise the wavelet methods. Contrary to several empirical studies in Africa (see, for example, Abid, 2016; Chekouri et al., 2021; Espoir & Sunge, 2021; Olubusoye & Musa, 2020; Omotor, 2016; Yusuf et al., 2020), in this study, we adopt the wavelet coherence transform, multiple wavelets and the partial wavelet analysis for decomposing the time in different time scales. The wavelet method has a consistent set of advantages compared to classical time domains. First, it offers short, medium, and long-run frameworks; second, it details the interaction between variables across different frequencies over time; and third, it displays the lead-lag and cyclical against countercyclical status of the nexus, as reported in Mutascu (2018). For each time scale, both time and frequency causality tests are performed to investigate the direction of interaction between Co2 emissions and income growth.

The scientific contributions of this study are fourfold. First, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first analysis that uses the wavelet methods to explore the interaction between Co2 emissions and income growth across climate regimes in Africa. The use of these techniques helps identify not only the direction of causality between Co2 emissions and income growth nexus but also its persistence over time. Second, the results are reinforced by alternative analysis exclusively from the frequency domain. Such an approach allows the examination of the persistence of causal effects over a period of time without sample splitting. Third, this study novelly applies the Augmented Mean Group panel estimation technique. Unlike classical, traditional panel techniques (Fixed and Random effects), this approach enables the investigation of heterogeneous effects of Co2 emissions and temperature on economic growth by taking into account the presence of cross-sectional dependence and slope heterogeneity. These two technical issues are likely to occur in a compact region like Africa due to common financial-economic-pandemic shocks, technological cross-borders spillovers, regional

conflicts, and regional economic integration (SADC, ECOWAS, COMESA, and EAC). Fourth, unlike the existing studies, this paper clarifies the effect of climatic factors of temperature and emissions on economic production in Africa at the international policies of climate changes cycle, crucial for policy decisions from both type and time-target perspectives.

The rest of the study is structured as follows. Section 2 covers the literature review; Section 4 outlines the materials and methods used. Results are presented and discussed in section 5, and Section 6 concludes.

2. Literature Review

Since the early 1990s, the link between economic growth and environmental deterioration has been a theoretical and empirical topic of study in the discipline of environmental economics (Abid, 2016). The relationship is founded on Kuznets' famous environmental Kuznets curve (EKC) theory (1955). The EKC implies that environmental deterioration and per-capita income have an inverted-U connection (Grossman and Krueger, 1991). Environmental deterioration would increase during the early stages of economic expansion; but, after a particular threshold of per capita income is reached, economic growth would result in better environmental outcomes (Abid, 2016). The EKC has generated a plethora of empirical examinations, with some (Fang et al., 2018; Espoir & Sunge, 2021; Kasperowicz, 2015; Lu, 2017; Zou & Zhang, 2020) confirming it while others (Aye & Edoja, 2017; Munir & Khan, 2014; Omotor, 2016) reject it. Several studies (Odhiambo, 2017; Omri et al., 2015; Spagnolo, 2012; Zaidi & Ferhi, 2019) have considered testing for causality between the variables.

These studies have been mixed and inconclusive mainly because of different country/regional samples, time, and econometric approaches. However, one aspect which has been under-researched is whether and how results vary according to climate regimes. At least some studies looked at the effects of temperature variations across countries at different levels of development. Dell et al. (2012) analyzed the differential effects of temperature shocks on economic growth between poor and rich countries. Using annual fluctuations in temperature and precipitation across the world from 1950 to 2003, three key findings were documented; (1) higher temperatures causes tremendous and significant negative growth in poor countries only, (2) the effects are on both growth rates and the level of output, and (3) the effects are more profound in reducing agricultural and industrial output and political stability. The study found no significant impact of precipitation. However, we observe that the analysis by Dell (2021) is based on short-run and medium-run fluctuations in temperature. There is every reason that, in the long run, countries may adapt to higher temperatures, thereby neutralizing the effects.

The long-run effects of temperature and climatic conditions on economic growth are also investigated by Kahn et al. (2019). The study used a stochastic growth panel data model of 174 economies over the period 1960 to 2014 in which climate change affects growth through labor productivity. Globally, results suggest that without mitigation strategies, an average annual global temperature change of 0.04°C will lower global real GDP per capita by at least 7% by 2100. More importantly, the impacts are significantly sensitive across countries according to the speed of temperature escalations and differences in climate conditions. Unlike the short-run results by Dell et al. (2012), the long-run analysis by Kahn et al. (2019) did not find different effects between poor and rich countries. The latter provided supplementary results of negative effects across USA states and economic sectors state. As in Dell et al. (2012), changes in precipitation do not have a significant impact on growth.

Another study acknowledging the reality that temperature and climate change effects are not universal is by Holtermann & Rische (2020). The study registered discomfort in that many studies were based on country-level weather aggregates, ignoring significant country variations. Dynamic spatial econometric approaches were used for analysis to recognize the possibility of spatial dependence through spillovers and heterogeneous effects for divergent spatial regimes. The study found that economic growth across regions responds non-linearly to increased temperature levels, echoing earlier evidence by Newell et al. (2018). A striking result from this study is that the effects also depend on baseline temperature levels. Hotter temperature changes have adverse effects in warmer regions but foster growth in colder regions. Similar evidence is given by Kalkuhl & Wenz (2018) from their assessment of the effects of climate on Gross Regional Product (GRP) in at least 1,500 regions in 77 countries. Findings suggest that yearly temperature shocks decrease GRP in temperate and tropical climate regimes while increasing it in cold regimes.

While several studies (including Abid, 2016; Adzawla et al., 2019; Al-Mulali & Che Sab, 2012; Bouznit & Pablo-Romero, 2016; Gorus & Aydin, 2019; Espoir et al., 2021; Espoir & Sunge, 2021) have looked at the Co2-economic growth relationship in Africa, very few (Abidoye & Odusola, 2015; Baarsch et al., 2020; Lanzafame, 2012; Odusola & Abidoye, 2017) focused on temperature effects. Using yearly data for 34 African countries for the period 1961-2009, Abidoye & Odusola (2015) find that a 1°C rise in temperature lowers GDP growth by 0.67 percentage points. However, when 5-year averages of temperature changes and economic growth are used, no relationship could be supported. In a related study, Odusola & Abidoye (2020) employed the Bayesian hierarchical modeling technique to distinguish between country-specific and Africa-wide effects of climate change. A 1 % increase in temperature was found to cause a 1.58 percentage point decrease in GDP. The negative impact of temperature was also confirmed by economic growth (Alagidede et al., 2014; Lanzafame, 2012) and income convergence (Baarsch et al., 2020).

While evidence from the studies above is quite important, the effect of temperature changes on the interaction and co-movement between Co2 and economic growth has not been dealt with clearly. Specifically, the effect of climate change regime has been sidelined. As a result, such studies turn a blind eye to the reality of the heterogeneous effects of climate variables, particularly temperature changes, the relationship between these variables of interest. Understandably, analyzing the interaction effects of variables is difficult to compute and interpret (Issartel et al., 2014). This can be done using wavelet estimation, which permits data extraction on how entities change and how long the transition is between states. It also helps to reveal the number of states that can occur in a given period (Issartel et al., 2014). This approach is sparingly used in analyzing the Co2 emission-economic growth relationship with Adebayo & Kirikkaleli (2021), and Magazzino et al. (2021) only used it recently.

Magazzino et al. (2021) recently assessed the climate change effects on economic productivity by paying attention to the heterogeneity of different climate regimes. The study picked six countries³ in five climatic regions⁴ and applied a wavelet estimation technique. The approach allowed setting up sequences of interaction between economic growth and Co2 emissions with temperature as a control variable. They show that the impact of temperature on the economic growth-Co2 emissions nexus varies across countries and climate regimes. In the highland regime, temperature extends the perseverance of Co2 emissions-economic growth effect. In the subtropical regime, temperature supports the growth-emissions nexus, albeit with no short-run effects. It pushes the co-movement of

³ Austria, Israel, Luxembourg, Kuwait, Singapore, and Norway

⁴ Tropical with its rainforest and desert extremes, subtropical, temperate, polar, and highland

persistence of the variables for the temperate and tropical regimes, only to fall in the long run. Again, Co2 spurs growth in the temperate regions while the reverse holds for tropical with the desert regime. The study's key finding is that temperature extends the strength of co-movement between growth and Co2 emissions. Finally, there was no correlation between Co2 emission and growth in tropical with rainforests and polar with tundra regimes.

3. Empirical model, data, and methodology

3.1. Empirical model

This study's main objective is to investigate the impact of temperature on the CO2 emissions-economic growth nexus across different climate regimes. We derive our econometric models from the famous Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC) hypothesis. In principle, the EKC hypothesis asserts that Co2 emissions increase up to a certain point in the initial stages of economic growth, beyond which they fall (Kamanda & Sunge, 2021). Accordingly, there exists an inverted-U-shaped relationship between the two. Following Grossman and Krueger (1991), the EKC theory, in panel data form, is expressed as:

$$Co2\ Emissions_{i,t} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Income_{i,t} + \alpha_2 (Income)_{i,t}^2 + X_{it} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (1)$$

Where *Co2 Emissions* and *Income* are the variables of our key interest and denote per capita income levels and stock of carbon dioxide emissions, respectively. *X* is a vector of additional explanatory variables, α s are parameters to be estimated, ε is the conventional error term, *i* is a country identifier, and *t* demotes time in years. A positive α_1 and a negative α_2 confirm the EKC hypothesis. Eq. (1) assumes unidirectional causality from economic growth to Co2 emissions. We agree with Barrassi & Spagnolo (2012) that such an imposition is too restrictive. Also, several studies (including Acheampong, 2018; Espoir et al., 2021; Barassi & Spagnolo, 2012; Zaidi & Ferhi, 2019) have confirmed that bi-directional causality exist between the two. Accordingly, we capture the possibility of reverse causality as follows:

$$Income_{i,t} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Co2\ Emissions_{i,t} + X_{it} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (2)$$

Testing the EKC theory is not our priority; hence we drop $(Income)_{i,t}^2$ in Eq. (1). Also, to match the specification by Magazzino et al. (2021), we use temperature as the *X* variable in Eq. (1) and Eq. (2). We also add the first lagged-dependent variables $Income_{i,t-1}$ and $Co2\ Emissions_{i,t-1}$. We use them to capture the dynamic, persistent effects of time-series (the historical norms) and minimising bias due to omitted control variables. Accordingly, we express the linear but dynamic income-emission-temperature nexus as:

$$Income_{i,t} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Income_{i,t-1} + \alpha_2 Temperature_{i,t} + \alpha_3 Co2\ Emissions_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (3)$$

$$Co2\ Emissions_{i,t} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Co2\ Emissions_{i,t-1} + \alpha_2 Temperature_{i,t} + \alpha_3 Income_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (4)$$

Where $Income_{i,t}$ and $Co2\ Emissions_{i,t}$ are the variables of our key interest and denote countries' income levels and stock of carbon dioxide emissions, respectively. $Income_{i,t-1}$ and $Co2\ Emissions_{i,t-1}$ are the first lagged-dependent variables used to capture the dynamic, persistent effects of time-series (the historical norms) and minimising bias due to omitted control variable bias.

α_0 is the constant term, whereas $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_3$ are the heterogeneous independent variables parameters, and $\varepsilon_{i,t}$ is the stochastic error term across countries i a time t .

3.2. Data

The data employed for estimating Eq. (3) and (4) is a dataset of 47 African countries and six climate regimes⁵, covering the period 1995-2016. Table 2 shows the list of countries included in our sample group and their classification according to their respective climate region (subtropical moist, subtropical dry, warm temperate moist, tropical moist, tropical dry, and tropical desert). Given the diversity of temperature and climate in one land area (in one country), the main criteria behind the grouping of countries into one given climate regime are the dominance of a particular climate in that specific land area and the availability of GDP per capita and carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions data. Concerning climate regime dominance, for example, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) is a country that is dominated by two main climates: the tropical moist and subtropical dry. The subtropical dry covers more than 65% of the country's total land area. Henceforth, the subtropical dry climate regime is selected for the DRC (see online Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2021).

Table 2: African countries and their climate regime classification

Climate regime classification					
STM	STD	WTM	TM	TDR	TDS
Angola	DRC	Eswatini	Cape Verde	Benin	Mali
Botswana	Burundi	Lesotho	Côte d'Ivoire	Burkina Faso	Niger
Madagascar	Uganda	South Africa	Ghana	Gambia	Egypt
Malawi	Gabon	Morocco	Guinea	Nigeria	Libya
Mozambique	Cameroon		Guinea-Bissau	Senegal	Algeria
Namibia	Congo		Togo	Chad	Mauritania
Tanzania	CAR		Sierra Leone		
Zambia			Comoros		
Zimbabwe			Mauritius		
Rwanda			Seychelles		
Tunisia			Equatorial Guinea		
Kenya					
Ethiopia					

Note: The classification of African countries into climate regimes as reported in this table corresponds to 47 countries included in our study sample. STM denotes Sub Tropical Moist, STD is Sub Tropical Dry, WTM is Warm Temperate Moist, TM is Tropical Moist, TDR is Tropical Dry, and TDS is Tropical Desert. Source: Classification performed based on data collected from World Development Indicators online database, World Bank (2021) and Encyclopedia Britannica (2021), World Climate Regions online map, accessed in June 2021.

Three variables interact to achieve the study's key objectives: Co₂ emissions, temperature, and economic growth. Co₂ emissions represent the total volume/stock of carbon dioxide emissions produced during consumption of solid, liquid, and gas fuels and gas flaring in metric tons per capita. Temperature captures the country-year-average levels of temperature. This variable is expressed as the difference between the highest and lowest temperature in Fahrenheit degrees. The final data employed for this variable is the annual average temperature, which is computed based on monthly average temperatures. Finally, economic growth, which is proxied by GDP per capita. GDP per capita represents the sum of gross value added by all resident producers in the country at a given time, plus any product taxes and minus any subsidies not included in the value of the products.

⁵ See the online Encyclopaedia Britannica (2021) for world climate regions

Temperature, CO2 emissions, and GDP per capita data are sourced from World Development Indicators online database, World Bank (2021). The three variables are used in natural logarithm form to minimise white noise due to outliers and obtain elasticities as percentage points. Moreover, the wavelet dataset requires differenced variables to increase the series volatility and remove their trend component (Mutascu, 2018). Therefore, we follow Magazzino et al. (2021) and convert the level variables into first differences for the final wavelet estimations.

3.3. Econometric methodology

Nowadays, it has become crucial to employ the appropriate econometric methodology when assessing the impact on economic development originating from the changes in one or multiple determinants. Traditional econometric techniques ignore two technical points: cross-sectional dependence (CD) and slope heterogeneity. Several studies recommend using second-generation econometric methods to minimise bias and inaccurate results if the two issues are present in the data (Bersvendsen & Ditzen, 2021; Espoir & Ngepah, 2021). Testing for CD in panel dataset is now compulsory because the world economies have become more financially and economically integrated. Due to this integration, the econometric literature firmly concludes that panel datasets are likely to present significant CD (Pesaran, 2004).

This dependence may happen because of the presence of common shocks, technological cross-country spillovers, integration into common markets, as well as unobserved components that ultimately form part of the error term (Espoir & Ngepah, 2021). Failing to account for CD could lead to spurious results if the errors ($\varepsilon_{i,t}$) are not independent across panel units (Herzer & Vollmer 2012). Concerning slope heterogeneity, panel data methodologies estimate variations in between cross-sectional units by fixed constants (using fixed and random effects techniques). However, some panel datasets exhibit individual variability in the slopes across cross-sectional units. Overlooking this variability may bias the results and cause incorrect inference (Chang et al., 2015; Bersvendsen & Ditzen, 2021). Thus, this study tests the issue of CD and slope heterogeneity before investigating the effect of temperature and Co2 emissions on economic growth across African countries.

3.3.1. Testing cross-sectional dependence and slope heterogeneity

The Lagrange multiplier (LM hereafter) procedure developed by Breusch and Pagan (1980) is often used to test for CD. It is important to note that the LM test is valid only for relatively small N and sufficiently large T (Chang et al., 2015). Given that our sample unit is sufficiently large than the time series length, using LM test will give invalid results. Thus, we used the residual-based cross-section dependence test recently developed by Pesaran (2004), which is relevant for finite and infinite samples. To test cross-sectional dependence, Pesaran (2004) relied on the following statistic:

$$\text{Pesaran}_{CD} = \sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^N \hat{\rho}_{i,j} \quad (5)$$

Where $\hat{\rho}_{i,j}$ is an average parameter denoting the correlation between the errors.

The Pesaran_{CD} indicates the comparison between p-value and significance levels (1,5 and 10%). This statistic allows us to determine whether CD is present in the panel data. In other words, when the p-value is smaller than the significance level, then there is evidence for the presence of CD, and thus the null hypothesis (i.e., no cross-sectional dependence) is rejected. Otherwise, we do not reject the null hypothesis.

Furthermore, we investigate whether or not the slope coefficients are homogeneous across panel units. We employ the standard delta test ($\tilde{\Delta}$) proposed by Pesaran and Yamagata (2008). This test is based on a standardised version of Swamy's (1970) test. The Swamy's (1970) test requires panel data models where N is small relative to T , while the Pesaran and Yamagata (2008) test analyses slope homogeneity in large panels where N and $T \rightarrow \infty$. For the $\tilde{\Delta}$ test, Pesaran and Yamagata (2008) proposed two main steps to obtain the test statistic. First, the authors suggested computing the modified version of Swamy's test as:

$$\tilde{S} = \sum_{i=1}^N \left((\hat{\beta}_i - \tilde{\beta}_{WFE}) \frac{X_i' M_T X_i}{\tilde{\sigma}_i^2} (\hat{\beta}_i - \tilde{\beta}_{WFE}) \right) \quad (6)$$

Where $\hat{\beta}_i$ and $\tilde{\beta}_{WFE}$ are vectors of coefficients from pooled OLS and weighted fixed effect pooled estimator, respectively. $\tilde{\sigma}_i^2$ is the estimator of σ_i^2 and M_T is an identity matrix. Using Swamy's statistic from Eq. (6), the standard delta statistic is developed as:

$$\tilde{\Delta} = \sqrt{N} \left(\frac{N^{-1} \tilde{S} - K}{\sqrt{2k}} \right) \quad (7)$$

Under the null hypothesis of slope homogeneity with the condition of $(N, T) \rightarrow \infty$ so long as \sqrt{N}/T , the $\tilde{\Delta}$ test has an asymptotic standard normal distribution ($\varepsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$). Furthermore, for the small sample properties, the $\tilde{\Delta}$ test can be improved under the same condition of normally distributed errors through a bias-adjusted version as:

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{adj} = \sqrt{N} \left(\frac{N^{-1} \tilde{S} - E(\tilde{Z}_{i,t})}{\sqrt{Var(\tilde{Z}_{i,t})}} \right) \quad (8)$$

where the mean $E(\tilde{Z}_{i,t}) = k$ and the variance $Var(\tilde{Z}_{i,t}) = \frac{2K(T-k-1)}{T+1}$

In the presence of cross-sectional dependence and slope heterogeneity, any econometric technique that imposes homogeneity restrictions and ignores spatial dependence effects might produce inaccurate results. Consequently, this study used the Augmented Mean Group (AMG) estimator, which is developed under the two technical issues discussed in this section.

3.3.2. Heterogeneous parameter estimations

3.3.2.1. Augmented Mean Group estimator and convergency analysis

Eberhardt and Teal (2010) introduced the AMG estimator to estimate the long-run effect in heterogeneous panel data, which accounts for cross-sectional dependence and slope heterogeneity. The AMG estimator is deemed a highly robust estimation technique. It provides parameters through two steps. The first step is combining the unobserved common factor with the time dummies in the following equation:

$$\Delta y_{i,t} = \beta_i + \rho_i \Delta x_{i,t} + \varphi g_t + \sum_{i=1}^N \vartheta_t D_t + v_{i,t} \quad (9)$$

Where $y_{i,t}$, and $x_{i,t}$ are dependent and independent variables, respectively. Δ denotes the first difference operator; β_i indicates the intercept; ρ_i represents the slope of each unit; φ is the

heterogeneous factor loadings, g_t represents the unobserved common factor; D and ϑ are the time dummies and their coefficients respectively, and $v_{i,t}$ is the stochastic error term.

The second step is getting the Mean Group (MG) estimator for AMG by averaging the slopes of each unit as:

$$AMG = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\rho}_i \quad (10)$$

Where $\hat{\rho}_i$ are the estimates of ρ_i in Eq. (9).

The AMG estimator yields consistent, efficient, and unbiased parameters in finite and large panel datasets (Bond and Eberhardt, 2013).

Furthermore, we examine the proposition of heterogeneous structural effects by testing the hypothesis of Co2 emissions and temperature convergence across African countries. We do so because the convergence effect is indicated to offset Co2 emissions and temperature across climate regimes by limiting substantial income disparities (Dell et al., 2009; Magazzino et al., 2021). Specifically, the convergence test helps examine the practicability of either country-specific or common global policies. We apply the methodology developed by Phillips and Sul (2007) to test for full-sample and club convergence and grouping of sampled countries based on similar climatic factors. We begin the procedure by filtering the series to create new trend components. Then, we utilise log-t-test using linear regression based on 33.3% discarded data proportion before estimation.

3.3.2.2. Wavelet estimation methods

We finally use a battery of wavelet estimation methods to empirically link—for each climate regime, the economic growth with Co2 emissions by controlling for temperature diversities. The wavelet methods we employ are the continuous wavelet transformation and wavelet coherency with phase-difference (partial and multiple wavelet coherency).

Regarding the wavelet transform method, it has to be noted that there are two types: continuous and discrete. While the Continuous Wavelet Transform (CWT) works with time series over the entire axis, the Discrete Wavelet Transform (DWT) deals with time series in a limited range. Aguiar-Conraria et al. (2008) show that the CWT is easier to manipulate. Hence, our study uses the CWT. Generally, the CWT function is decomposed in time series by ensuring a zero mean and localized time-frequency space. From this decomposition, it is plausible to get the information from the local area. Moreover, it has to be highlighted that the decomposition of the CWT is achieved through the Morlet function. The general use of the Morlet function is to examine the behaviour of time series in terms of time and frequency domain. The Morlet function is defined as:

$$\varphi^M(t) = \frac{1}{\pi^{1/4}} e^{i\omega_0 t} e^{-t^2/2} \quad (11)$$

Where ω_0 and t denote, respectively, the central frequency of wavelet at the set of 6 and the non-dimensional time parameter. Furthermore, according to Rua and Nunes (2009), with convolution applied to a discrete sequence and a scaled and translated wavelet, the CWT can be defined as:

$$W_s(u, s) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x(t) \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}} \omega\left(\frac{t-u}{s}\right) dt \quad (12)$$

Where s , u , and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{s}}$ represent, respectively, the scale dilation parameter, the localisation parameter that provides the wavelet's exact position, and the normalization factor. The CWT is used to check the co-movement between two series (parameters).

Another powerful wavelet estimation tool widely used in recent literature is the Wavelet Coherence (WC). Torrence & Compo (1998) identify the WC of two-time series x and y as the correlation coefficient localized between the two series in the time and frequency domain. Torrence and Webster (1999) show that the computing of the WC is considered as the squared absolute value of the normalized smoothed cross-wavelet spectra multiplied by the smoothed individual wavelet power spectra of each time series. Therefore, the equation of the wavelet coherence is given by:

$$WC = \frac{|s(s^{-1}W_{xy}(u,s))|}{s(s^{-1}|W_x(u,s)|^{1/2})s(s^{-1}|W_y(u,s)|^{1/2})} \quad (13)$$

Where x and y describe the phase correlations between the two-time series, and s denotes the smoothing parameter. The WC will be equal to one in the no-smoothing scenario. In contrast, the coefficient of smoothed wavelet coherence satisfies the interval $0 \leq WC \leq 1$. A WC coefficient close to zero designates a weak correlation between x and y , whereas a coefficient close to one indicates a high correlation between x and y . The lateness of the wavering between the two series is quietly provided by the phase difference as a function of frequency and describes the positional relationship between the two-time series.

However, the WC estimation method is divided into two types: the Multiple Wavelet Coherence (MWC) and Partial Wavelet Coherence (PWC). The MWC and PWC were developed by Mihanović et al. (2009) to examine the co-movement between two time-series x and y while controlling for a third determinant, z . Ng & Chan (2012) frames the MWC by stipulating that the relationship of the variables with each other is considered when measuring the phase differences and coherency. They propose that the MWC runs related to the multiple correlations that can capture the coherency of multiple independent variables on a dependent one. The MWC is given by the following expression:

$$RM^2(y, x, z) = \frac{R^2(y, x) + R^2(y, z) - 2R_e[R(y, x) * R(y, z) * R(x, z)]}{1 - R^2(x, z)} \quad (14)$$

Where RM^2 designates the multiple wavelet squared correlation between y , x , and z . y is the dependent variable, x is the independent variable, and z is the control variable. Transposing this to our case, y corresponds to economic growth, x is Co2 emissions, and z is temperature. The MWC method determines the impact of Co2 emissions on GDP per capita while considering temperature as a control variable. The Monte Carlo simulation is used in the estimation procedure to determine the statistical significance of the MWC method (see Aloui et al., 2018). On the other hand, the PWC method identifies the wavelet coherence between two-time series x and y after eliminating the power of the third series z . The PWC squared after removing the effect of z is given by a similar equation to the partial correlation squared written as:

$$R_p^2(y, x, z) = \frac{|R(y, x) - R(y, z) * R(y, x)|^2}{[1 - R(y, z)]^2 [1 - R(z, x)]^2} \quad (15)$$

Where $*$ indicates a complex conjugate and R_p^2 denotes the squared partial wavelet. The coefficient of the partial wavelet satisfies the interval $0 \leq R_p^2 \leq 1$. It is recognised as the squared partial correlation between series x and y after controlling for the effect of z in the time and frequency domain.

4. Empirical Results and discussion

4.1. Results of slope heterogeneity and cross-sectional dependence

We begin by testing the heterogeneous effects of temperature, Co2 emissions, and income across different climate regimes in Africa. To this end, we perform two analyses. First, we execute a univariate kernel density estimation of the logarithm of Co2 emissions and GDP per capita and temperature. The results are presented in Figure 3. As can be observed from this figure, the results approve the diversity of estimated emissions, income, and temperature across climate regimes in Africa. Therefore, the results indicate the significant degree of heterogeneity within the panel data, underpinning the usefulness of estimating unobserved and structural heterogeneous effects.

Second, we check if slope heterogeneity across climate regimes exists. Together with the CD test, this test help to decide whether the first- or second-generation econometric methods should be used or not in subsequent analyses. We report the results of slope heterogeneity and that of the CD test in Table 2. For the two regression equations (income and Co2 emissions equation), the statistic of the two tests ($\tilde{\Delta}$ and $\tilde{\Delta}_{adj}$) reject the null hypothesis of slope homogeneity at the 1% level of significance across all the panel units. This signifies that the economic growth regression analysis by assuming slope homogeneity restrictions may provide inaccurate inferences and misleading results.

Thus, our study takes into account countries' specific characteristics in analysing the effect of temperature and Co2 emissions on growth in Africa. Furthermore, the results of the CD test are also reported in Table 2. The statistic for the income equation is statistically significant at the 1% significance level, while that of the Co2 emissions equation is insignificant. For the income equation, the significant results indicate that an economic, financial, and pandemic shock originating from one country may produce spatial spillover effects in neighboring countries. Henceforth, the econometric technique to investigate the impact of temperature and Co2 emissions on growth in Africa should control for this dependence.

4.2. Results of long-run effects and convergence

Following the presence of cross-sectional and slope heterogeneity in our panel data, we conform to the recent econometric literature and employ the AMG estimator. The estimator considers spillover effects, global financial-economic-pandemic-driven shocks, and unobserved common factors with heterogeneous effects across countries. The results of this analysis are also presented in Table 3. For the income function, the results indicate that the coefficient of the first period lag of income ($Income_{i,t-1}$) is positive and statistically significant at the 10% significance level. This finding suggests that the historical records of income level in Africa have a positive long-run impact on the current economic production path amongst emissions and temperature dynamics. We additionally observe that a 1% increase in temperature declines income by 1.08%, while a 1% rise in Co2 emission levels boosts income level by 0.23%.




Figure 3: Heterogenous effects using kernel density estimation: (a) CO2 emissions, (b) GDP per capita, and (c) Temperature.

Our findings of the long-run effects of temperature and Co2 emissions are similar to those in the study of Magazzino et al. (2021), which reports an effect of 0.39% and 0.22%, respectively. Moreover, Dell et al. (2009) present results indicating that a 1% rise in average temperature decreases income by 0.09% across 12 developing and developed countries.

Concerning the Co2 emissions equation, we find exciting findings. The regression results indicate that the long-term impact on the current stock of Co2 emissions from its lagged-emission level ($Co2\ Emissions_{i,t-1}$) is positive and statistically significant at the 1% significance level. No significant long-run effect is obtained in the emission-temperature relationship. Meanwhile, the results show that a 1% increase in income level escalates emissions by 0.19%. This finding is similar to that of Kamanda and Sunge (2021) that report a positive effect of about 0.03% from a similar sample group. In sum, Table 3 shows the existence of a causal relationship between Co2 emission and income levels in Africa. This implies that increasing emissions levels from the agrarian type of production to industrialized economic structures with limited green growth support variations in income levels in Africa. On the other hand, environmental sustainability attributed to the Kuznets curve assumes that expansion of income leads to environmental awareness, reducing pollution in the long term (Sarkodie et al., 2019; Magazzino, 2021). Policy-wise, the finding of the causal relationship between Co2 emissions and income implies that environmental policies specifically designed to reduce Co2 emissions may significantly impact production. In contrast, growth-accelerating policies may dramatically increase the stock of Co2 emissions in Africa.

Table 3: Heterogeneous estimation of emissions, temperature, and income

Estimation	Income	Emissions
Co2 Emissions _{t-1}	-	0.357*** (0.128) [0.106; 0.608]
Income _{t-1}	0.081* (0.049) [-0.178; 0.014]	-
Temperature	-1.078*** (0.439) [-1.940; -0.215]	0.725 (0.837) [-0.916; 2.367]
Co2 Emissions	0.231*** (0.095) [0.043; 0.419]	-
Income	-	0.192*** (0.087) [0.020; 0.364]
C-d-p	0.911*** (0.055) [0.803; 1.019]	0.710 (0.494) [-0.257; 1.679]
Trend	0.001 (0.007) [-0.014; 0.015]	0.0001 (0.005) [-0.010; .011]
Constant	4.747*** (1.504) [1.798; 7.696]	1.062 (2.127) [-3.106; 5.232]
$Pesaran_{CD}$	11.427*** {0.000}	-0.321 {1.2519}
$\tilde{\Delta}$	6.277*** {0.000}	2.060*** {0.039}
$\tilde{\Delta}_{adj}$	6.940*** {0.000}	2.360*** {0.018}

Notes: ***, **, and * signify statistical significance at p-value < 0.01, 0.05, and 0.1; (...) is the generated standard errors, [...] is the 95% confidence interval, whereas {...} is the calculated p-value. Variable C-d-p refers to the common dynamic process, while the variable Trend refers to the group-specific linear trend terms.

Next, we analyse the hypothesis suggesting that the effect of climate change is assumed to have transboundary or spatial spillover effects across climate regimes due to global common shocks (Magazzino, 2021). To test this hypothesis, we use the log-t regression algorithm to estimate the state of convergence of emissions and temperature across climate regimes in Africa. The results of this analysis are reported in Table 4. The estimated results indicate that the t-test statistics obtained from

the log-t regression algorithm for both emissions and temperature are less than the 5% critical value of -1.65. Consequently, the null hypothesis of convergence across climate regimes in Africa is rejected. However, the lack of convergence at the African level does not cast off the possibility of club clustering or club formation. We, therefore, investigate the possibility of observing club formation or club clustering using Phillips and Sul's (2007) club clustering algorithm, results of which are also presented in Table 4.

From this analysis, we observe that Ghana, Senegal, Togo, Mauritius, Seychelles, South Africa, Rwanda, and Gabon converge in Club 1 emission membership. Benin, Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Nigeria, Angola, DRC, Eswatini, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Chad, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, Uganda, Kenya, and Ethiopia converge in Club 2 emission membership. Gambia and Guinea converge in Club 3 emission membership; Burkina Faso, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, and Botswana converge in Club 4 emission membership; whereas Sierra Leone, Lesotho and Mauritania converge in Club 5 emission membership. Madagascar, Burundi, and Libya converge in Club 6 emission membership, while Comoros, Cameroon, and Egypt converge in Club 7 emission membership. Niger, Equatorial Guinea, Congo, the Republic of, and the Central African Republic are the countries that form the non-convergent Club (8th Club).

In contrast, Burkina Faso, Mali, Niger, Senegal, and Namibia converge in Club 1 temperature membership; Benin and Morocco converge in Club 2 temperature membership; whereas Gambia and Ghana form Club 3 temperature membership. Guinea-Bissau, Nigeria, and Libya are part of Club 4 temperature membership; Côte d'Ivoire and Sierra Leone converge in Club 5 temperature membership. Malawi, Uganda, Kenya, and Cameroon form Club 6 temperature membership; Ethiopia and Gabon are in Club 7 temperature membership; Botswana, Comoros, Mauritius, and Zimbabwe constitute Club 8 temperature membership. Cape Verde, Lesotho, Tunisia, Mauritania, and Equatorial Guinea constitute Club 9 temperature membership. Also, Angola, South Africa, and Rwanda are part of Club 10 temperature membership; Togo, DRC, Madagascar, Mozambique, Tanzania, Zambia, and Chad converge in Club 11 temperature membership, whereas Seychelles, Burundi, and Algeria form Club 12 temperature membership. Finally, Guinea, Eswatini, Egypt, Congo Republic, and the Central African Republic constitute Club 13, where the temperature does not converge. Figure 4 in the Appendix presents the club relative transition path for both Co2 emissions and temperature. However, the club convergence findings further strengthen the argument of heterogeneous structural impacts by suggesting that the common global climatic policies may not yield the expected outcome compared to country-specific based policies.

Furthermore, we conduct two additional regressions to confirm the convergence results of emissions and temperature. First, we employ the conditional panel inter-and intra- group trend estimator to examine group regression trends in a bivariate specification. We perform four different regressions across climate regimes. In all the four regressions, we control for additional covariate and omitted-variable bias. The results are presented in Figure 5. In the emission-temperature model, we account for historical temperature variations and income levels depicted in Figure 5(a). The inter-and intra-functions reveal that increasing emission levels escalate extreme temperatures TDS and STM—owing to unobserved confounders within countries. In the emission-income regression, we observe that increased emissions spur income growth in WTS, TDS, TM, and TDR while decreasing emissions in STD and STM. [Figure 5(b)].

Table 4: Emissions and temperature final club convergence/divergence results

Results for Co2 emissions	Country name	$\hat{\beta}Coef$	$t - stat$
Full-sample		-1.494***	-90.794
Final club classification			
1 st Club	Ghana Senegal Togo Mauritius Seychelles South Africa Rwanda Gabon	3.892	25.104
2 nd Club	Benin Cape Verde Côte d'Ivoire Nigeria Angola DRC Eswatini Malawi Mozambique Namibia Tanzania Zambia Zimbabwe Chad Tunisia Algeria Morocco Uganda Kenya Ethiopia	-1.447***	-59.846
3 rd Club	Gambia Guinea	-0.361	-0.875
4 th Club	Burkina Faso Guinea-Bissau Mali Botswana	-1.292***	-44.472
5 th Club	Sierra Leone Lesotho Mauritania	-1.493***	-70.602
6 th Club	Madagascar Burundi Libya	-1.004***	-49.960
7 th Club	Comoros Egypt Cameroon	-1.602***	-160.176
Non-convergent group (8 th Club)	Niger Equatorial Guinea Congo, Republic of Central African Republic	-2.076***	-34.794
Results for Temperature			
Full-sample		-0.7359***	-17.8241
Final club classification			
1 st Club	Burkina Faso Mali Niger Senegal Namibia	-0.666 ***	-12.603
2 nd Club	Benin Morocco	-0.687***	-14.622
3 rd Club	Gambia Ghana	1.005	1.868
4 th Club	Guinea-Bissau Nigeria Libya	-0.865***	-8.349
5 th Club	Côte d'Ivoire Sierra Leone	-1.795	-1.203
6 th Club	Malawi Uganda Kenya Cameroon	-1.097***	-7.016
7 th Club	Ethiopia Gabon	-0.590***	-4.301
8 th Club	Botswana Comoros Mauritius Zimbabwe	-1.124***	-4.879
9 th Club	Cape Verde Lesotho Tunisia Mauritania Equatorial Guinea	-0.679***	-12.616
10 th Club	Angola South Africa Rwanda	-0.392***	-3.815
11 th Club	Togo DRC Madagascar Mozambique Tanzania Zambia Chad	-0.873***	-14.382
12 th Club	Seychelles Burundi Algeria	-1.017***	-21.778
Non-convergent group (13 th Club)	Guinea Eswatini Egypt Congo, Republic of Central African Republic	-0.519***	-6.170

Note: ** indicate rejection of the null hypothesis (H_0) of convergence as well as club convergence merging at the 5% level. Estimation uses truncation parameter: $z = 0.33$ and asymptotic critical value: $c = 0.3$. The t-statistic at the 5% significance level: -1.645 .

Concerning the income-emission gradient, the result shows that increasing income levels raise emissions in WTM, STM, and TDS, while decreasing emissions in TM [Figure 5(c)]. Finally, in the temperature-income regression, the results suggest that an increase in average temperature produces a favorable effect on income level in WTM, TDS, STM, and TDS, whereas decreasing income level in STD and TM [Figure 5(d)]. This specific finding is not surprising since it is shown that a shift from cold temperature to warmer temperature improves economic production in colder territories. In contrast, a shift from optimal warmer temperatures to extreme temperatures leads to economic losses. Similarly, warming declines economic productivity in low-altitude countries while expanding economic development in high-altitude countries (Diffenbaugh and Burke, 2019; Magazzino, 2021).

Second, we fit the Swamy (1970) random-coefficients linear regression for the income model, which does not impose the assumption of constant parameters across panels to obtain group-specific coefficients. The results of these regressions are reported in Table 6 of the Appendix. They corroborate the finding of the convergence test and those of the conditional panel inter-and intra-group trend. Consequently, our finding validates the argument of structural heterogeneous impacts by suggesting that the common global climatic policies may not yield the expected outcome compared to country-specific based policies.




Figure 5: Heterogenous impact between (a) Co2 and temperature; (b) CO2 and income; (c) income and Co2; and (d) temperature and income. The blue diamond symbol (◆) denotes group means (between-country means) of climate regimes, whereas the green slope arrow (→) indicates the within-group variation of the estimated country-specific relationship gradient while controlling for lagged-dependent variable and additional covariate bias. In Figure 5(a), we include the first lag of temperature and income level. In Figure 5(b), we control for the first lag of income and temperature, in Figure 5(c), we account for the first lag of emissions and temperature, and finally, in Figure 5(d), we account for lagged-income and emissions.

4.3. Country-specific climate regime

We further investigate country-specific regimes using wavelet regression methods. As indicated earlier, we regroup African countries into six different climate regimes: STM, STD, WTM, TM, TDR, and TDS. In each regime, we try to find the interaction effect between income and Co2 emissions by considering temperature as a controlled variable. We maintain three frequency band scales (see Table 5). Figures 6-8 exhibit the estimated results of the first climate regime (STM). From WTC [Figure 6(a)] plot, two key episodes appear. The first episode is observed at high frequency (up to 1 and half-year band of scale, i.e., short-term) covering 1998–2001. As the arrows point to the left and upward, Co2 emissions positively influence income growth. The second episode is revealed at high frequency (2.8 to 3 years band of scale, i.e., long-term), over the period 2003–2008. The direction of the arrows is upright, suggesting that income growth positively drives Co2 emissions in the long run. By including temperature in MWC [Figure 6 (b)], we observe that temperature reduces the intensity of co-movement between income and Co2 emissions. In other words, this regression indicates that the registered co-movement in WTC is reduced for the long-term episode according to the intense yellow area in MWC, which appears at high frequency (up to 2 years band of scale), over the period 2000–2003. Moreover, fascinating results are observed by removing the temperature in PWC [Figure 6(c)].

We detect two episodes. The first episode is observed at high frequency (from 1.9 to 2.5 years band of scale, i.e., medium-term) covering the period 2000–2009. The second episode is detected at high frequency (from 1.5 to 1.9 years band of scale, i.e., medium-term) covering the period 2008–2012. Overall, we discern that temperature is not a critical factor driving co-movement between Co2 emissions and income levels in countries parting to STM climate regime.

Table 5: Frequency interpretation of time scales for yearly data.

Time scale	Yearly frequency
d1	1.2 -1.79 years
d2	1.8-2.59 years
d3	2.6 years and up

Source: Authors' own elaboration

The results of the STD climate regime are presented in Figure 7. We observe only one significant effect between Co2 emissions and income reported in WTC plots [Figure 7(a)]. In this plot, at high frequency (from 5 to 2.2 years band of scale, i.e., medium-term), over 1999–2002. The arrows are oriented to the right and up, suggesting that income growth positively influences Co2 emissions in the medium period. In MWC [Figure 7(b)] we consider the intermediating effect of temperature. The result indicates a shift from medium to long-term co-movement. Specifically, we see that temperature extends the intensity of co-movement between income and Co2 emissions. The intensity appears at high frequency (from 2 to 2.6 years band of scale), over the period 2004-2011. When we remove temperature in PWC [Figure 7(c)], two distinct co-movements appear. First, we see a co-movement at high frequency (from 1.6 to 1.9 years band of scale, i.e., short-term) covering the period 2006–2009. Second, we witness a co-movement at high frequency (from 2.8 and up the band of scale, i.e., long-term). This suggests that the temperature serves as a ground for income and Co2 emissions connection in the long-term in the STD climate regime.

For the WTM climate regime in Figure 8, income growth positively influences Co2 emissions at medium frequency, as the arrows point to the right and upward in related WTC [Figure 8(a)]. The medium frequency refers to the period 2000–2004 (from 1.6 to 1.8 years band of scale, i.e., medium-term). When we included the temperature as a control variable in MWC [Figure 8(b)] and when we remove it in PWC [Figure 8(c)], we observe the persistence of co-movement between Co2 and income growth. This co-movement is seen at high frequency (from 1.5 to 2.2 years band of scale, i.e., medium-term), throughout 2000–2004. These findings imply that temperature is not a significant factor driving co-evolution between Co2 emissions and income levels in countries that belong to the WTM climate regime.

The findings of TM are presented in Figure 9. Growth positively drives Co2 emissions over 2009–2012, at the medium frequency (from 1.2 to 1.6 years band of scale, i.e., short-term) with arrows oriented to the right and up, WTC [Figure 9(a)]. However, the positive influence of income growth is not statistically significant. Next, we include temperature as a control variable in the Co2 emissions and income growth co-evolution. As can be seen in MWC [Figure 9(b)], income growth positively determines Co2 emissions over 2009–2012, at high frequency (from 1.2 to 1.6 years band of scale, i.e., short-term). When we remove temperature in PWC regression [figure 9(c)], we see no significant effect in the co-movement between Co2 emissions and income growth. Hence, the MWC regression's inclusion highlights the significant role that temperature plays in driving the effect of income growth on Co2 emissions in the TM climate regime.




Figure 6-8: The set WTC-MWC-PWC of 'GDP per capita - CO2 emissions' pair with temperature as a control variable in MWC and PWC. The first row is STM, the second row is WTC, and the third row is WTM. Legend: (1) The thick black contour indicates the 5% significance level. The lighted shadow shows the cone of influence (COI) where the edge effects might distort the picture. (2) The color code for power ranges goes from blue (low power) to yellow color (high power), suggesting the intensity of co-movement. (3) The phase difference between the two series is indicated by arrows position: the variables are in a phase when the arrows point to the right (positively linked) and out of phase when the arrows point to the left (negatively linked). In the phase scenario, growth drives emissions when the arrows are oriented to the right and up. CO2 emissions drive growth when the arrows are pointed to the right and downward. In the out-of-phase scenario, growth explains emissions when the arrows are oriented to the left and downward. CO2 emissions predict growth when the arrows point to the left and up. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article).

The case of TDR is displayed in Figure 10. Co2 emissions positively run income growth at high frequency, as the arrows are pointed to the right and downward in related WTC [Figure 10(a)]. In this figure, the high frequency refers to the period between 2006 and 2012 (from 1.2 to 1.7 years band of scale, i.e., short and medium-term). We perform additional regression to test the robustness of the WTC result for the TDR climate regime. As for the other climate regime, we execute the MWC and PWC regression [Figure 10(b) and 10(c)]. Figure 10(b) includes the temperature as a control variable that helps depict the exact co-movement between Co2 emissions and income growth. The temperature insertion in MWC [Figure 10(b)] confirms the significant effect of co-movement between Co2 emissions and income growth nexus at the 5% significant level. As intense yellow color proves for the period between 2009 and 2011 (from 1.2 to 1.4 years band of scale, i.e., short-term), the result confirms that Co2 emissions positively influences income growth. On the other hand, in Figure 10(c), we remove the temperature variable to test the Co2 emissions and income growth co-movement with the PWC regression [Figure 10(c)]. The result shows that no significant effect is depicted between the two variables. Therefore, we conclude that temperature plays a significant role in explaining the interaction between Co2 emissions and income growth in countries grouped into the TDR climate regime.

Finally, the findings of TDS are displayed in Figure 11. As can be observed in WTC [Figure 11(a)], the arrows are pointing to the right, suggesting that the Co2 emissions and income growth are in a phase (i.e., positively correlated). Further, we execute additional regressions to validate the WTC result for the TDS climate regime. We run the MWC and PWC regression [Figure 11(b) and 11(c)]. Figure 10(b) includes the temperature as a control variable to depict the co-movement between Co2 emissions and income growth. The results we obtain with the temperature insertion in MWC [Figure 11(b)] show three episodes. The first episode is observed at high frequency (from 1.2 to 1.4 years band of scale, i.e., short-term) covering the period 2009–2013. The second episode is detected at high frequency (from 1.9 to 2.2 years band of scale, i.e., medium-term) covering the period 2001–2004. The third episode is also detected at high frequency (from 2.6 and up years band of scale, i.e., long-term) covering the period 2004–208. Finally, we remove temperature in the PWC regression [Figure 11(c)]. The result shows a co-movement only at high frequency (from 1.2 to 1.4 years band of scale, i.e., short-term). Thus, we conclude that there is a persistent co-evolution between Co2 emissions and income growth in the short term for countries that form the TDS climate regime.

In sum, in the STM climate regime, we conclude that temperature extends the co-movement between Co2 emissions and income growth in the medium-term. However, it is not a critical factor driving co-movement between the two variables in the long term. In the STD climate regime, the temperature serves as a ground for income and Co2 emissions connection in the long term. For the WTM, we find that temperature is not a significant factor neither in the short and medium-term nor in the long-term in driving co-movement between Co2 emissions and income levels. Moreover, an exciting result for TM highlights the significant role that temperature plays in driving the effect of income growth on Co2 emissions in the short term. For the TDR climate regime, we conclude that temperature plays a significant role in explaining the interaction between Co2 emissions and income growth only in the short term. Finally, the TDS climate regime results indicate no significant role of temperature in the interaction between Co2 emissions and income growth. This conclusion is taken since there is a persistent co-evolution between Co2 emissions and income growth in the short-term.

The impact of temperature in Co2 emissions and growth nexus differs from climate-to-climate regime. Country-specific geographical and economic contexts firmly particularise this difference. This conclusion is drawn regardless of whether the evidence occurs in the short, medium, or long term.




Figure 9-11: The set WTC-MWC-PWC of 'GDP per capita - CO2 emissions' pair with temperature as control variable in MWC and PWC. The first row is 'TM', the second row is 'TDR', and the third row is 'TDS'. Legend: (1) The thick black contour indicates the 5% significance level. The lighted shadow shows the cone of influence (COI) where the edge effects might distort the picture. (2) The color code for power ranges goes from blue (low power) to yellow color (high power), suggesting the intensity of co-movement. (3) The phase difference between the two series is indicated by arrows position: the variables are in a phase when the arrows point to the right (positively linked) and out of phase when the arrows point to the left (negatively linked). In the phase scenario, growth drives emissions when the arrows are oriented to the right and up, while CO2 emissions drive growth when the arrows are pointed to the right and downward. In the out-of-phase scenario, growth explains emissions when the arrows are oriented to the left and downward. CO2 emissions predict growth when the arrows point to the left and up. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.

5. Conclusion

In recent times, the necessity to examine the impact of climate change on various human activities has grown in importance. This is because, although rising global population and industrialization accelerate energy demand and consumption, a variety of human activities have also resulted in the usage of inputs that raise global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. In 2018, carbon dioxide (Co2) emissions, which account for more than 65 percent of total GHG emissions, hit new highs of 36.4 million tonnes. Given the foregoing, it is more likely that the achievement of the Paris climate agenda at the horizon of 2050 will fall short of the objective.

This study investigates the heterogeneous effects of Co2 emissions and temperature on economic growth across climate regimes in Africa. First, we test the heterogeneous effects of temperature, Co2 emissions, and income across different climate regimes. We perform two analyses in this stage. We execute a univariate kernel density estimation of the logarithm of Co2 emissions and GDP per capita and temperature and check if slope heterogeneity across climate regimes exists. Our kernel density results show diversity in emissions, income, and temperature across climate regimes in Africa. This underpins the fact that a significant degree of heterogeneity exists within our panel data, thereby justifying the need to estimate unobserved and structural heterogeneous effects as opposed to similar studies. Contrary to existing studies that impose country homogeneity on the relationship between temperature, Co2 emissions, and growth, our results of slope heterogeneity reject this hypothesis across all the panel units. We conclude that by assuming slope homogeneity, studies on economic growth may provide unreliable and spurious results.

The second unique feature of our study is that we adopt the augmented mean group estimator (AMG) to estimate the long-run relationship between Co2, temperature, and income. The AMG estimator takes into account spillover effects, global financial-economic-pandemic-driven shocks, and unobserved common factors with heterogeneous effects across countries. Regarding the income function, our results for income are significant and positive. We conclude that on the trajectory of economic production, income levels have a positive long-run effect amidst Co2 emission and temperature dynamics in Africa. More so, we observe that increase in temperature declines income while a rise in Co2 emission levels raises income. For the Co2 emissions function, we find a positive and significant long-term effect of the lagged-emission level on the current stock of Co2 emissions. At the same time, our results show that an increase in income causes Co2 emissions to rise in Africa. The strong and significant relationship between Co2 emissions and income means that a country's emissions will rise in lockstep with per capita income, given that fossil fuels support wealth creation. However, no significant long-run effect is obtained in the emission-temperature relationship.

Subsequently, we assess the state of convergence in Co2 emissions and temperature across climate regimes in Africa. Our study identifies 8 club convergence membership for Co2 emission. Club 1 entails Ghana, Senegal, Togo, Mauritius, Seychelles, South Africa, Rwanda, and Gabon. Club 2 comprises Benin, Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Nigeria, Angola, DRC, Eswatini, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Chad, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, Uganda, Kenya, and Ethiopia. In club 3 are Gambia and Guinea, and club 4 entails Burkina Faso, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, and Botswana. Sierra Leone, Lesotho, and Mauritania are in Club 5. Madagascar, Burundi, and Libya form Club 6; Comoros, Cameroon, and Egypt make up Club 7; whereas Niger, Equatorial Guinea, Congo, Republic of, and Central African Republic (CAR) are the countries that form the non-convergent Club (8th Club). Contrarily, 12 club convergence membership is identified for temperature.

Club 1 consists of Burkina Faso, Mali, Niger, Senegal, and Namibia; club 2 entails Benin and Morocco; club 3 comprise Gambia and Ghana. Guinea-Bissau, Nigeria, and Libya form club 4; Côte d'Ivoire and Sierra Leone make up club 5. Club 6 comprises Malawi, Uganda, Kenya, and Cameroon. Ethiopia and Gabon form club 7; Botswana, Comoros, Mauritius, and Zimbabwe constitute Club 8, while Cape Verde, Lesotho, Tunisia, Mauritania, and Equatorial Guinea make up club 9. In club 10 are Angola, South Africa, and Rwanda. Togo, DRC, Madagascar, Mozambique, Tanzania, Zambia, and Chad make club 11, whereas Seychelles, Burundi, and Algeria form club 12. Lastly, Guinea, Eswatini, Egypt, Congo Republic, and the Central African Republic constitute the non-convergent Club (club 13). These findings have important policy implications. In reducing Co2 emissions below pre-industrial levels, African Countries, in particular, must embrace innovative methods that substantially contribute to a long-term growth process while maintaining high environmental standards. Due to heterogeneity among the countries under examination, a single-level policy for all countries may not be particularly effective. However, the club convergence membership implies that emission-based strategies can be replicated across countries found within a particular club.

In the inter-and intra- function emission-temperature path, we show that increased emission levels lead to extreme temperatures in Tropical Desert (TDS) and Sub Tropical Moist (STM) climatic zones. This is primarily due to unobserved confounders within countries. In the emission-income path, we observe that growth in emission increase income levels in Warm Temperate Moist (WTM), TDS, Tropical Moist (TM), and Tropical Dry (TDR) while decreasing income in Sub Tropical Dry (STD) and STM. The strong positive effect between emission and income reaffirms the need for countries to embark on energy transition. On the income-emission path, we show that increasing income levels raise emissions in WTM, STM, and TDS while decreasing emissions in TM. More so, in the temperature-income path, we observe an increase in average temperature leads to a positive impact on income levels in WTM, TDS, STM, and TDS while decreasing income levels in STD and TM. This shows that while a change in temperature from cold to warm improves economic production in colder climatic territories, switching from optimal warmer temperatures to extreme temperatures may yield economic losses. This implies that variations in temperature from optimal levels may reduce economic production in the DRC, Burundi, Uganda, Gabon, Cameroon, Congo, Central African Republic, Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Togo, Sierra Leone, Comoros, Mauritius, Seychelles, and Equatorial Guinea.

We recommend that emissions reduction plans be streamlined based on emission convergence routes that are specific to country clusters. Given the prevalence of spillover effects, country-specific structures must be taken into account when creating and executing policies to reduce emissions, so that other countries are not harmed as a result of the influence and actions of others. In order to ensure that economic growth and environmental sustainability is achieved in African countries, international organizations and private investors should boost their investments in renewable energy development projects. Further, future research to extend this analysis to sub-regional country levels. This may help extend our understanding of the heterogeneous short, medium, and long-term income impacts of Co2 emissions and temperature.

Appendix




Figure 4: Relative transition path by Club during 1995-2016. (a) Co2 emissions and (b) temperature

Table 6: Heterogeneous estimation of emissions, temperature, and income (Group-specific coefficients)

Estimation	Income equation					
	STM	STD	WTM	TM	TDR	TDS
Income _{t-1}	0.978*** (0.059) [0.862; 1.094]	0.881*** (0.053) [0.776; 0.986]	0.771*** (0.067) [0.638; 0.904]	0.876*** (0.043) [0.790; 0.962]	0.881*** (0.046) [0.790; 0.972]	0.791*** (.085) [0.624; 0.959]
Temperature	-1.143 (1.229) [-3.553; 1.266]	1.065 (1.491) [-1.856; 3.987]	1.656* (0.959) [-3.536; 0.223]	-0.349 (1.107) [-2.519; 1.820]	-0.872 (1.051) [-2.933; 1.188]	-0.128 (1.214) [-2.508; 2.250]
Co2 Emissions	-0.152 (0.193) [-0.531; .227]	-0.349*** (0.197) [-0.736; 0.037]	1.104*** (0.394) [0.330; 1.878]	0.192*** (0.077) [0.041; 0.343]	0.176* (.099) [-0.019; 0.372]	0.566 (0.375) [-0.168; 1.302]
Constant	-3.409 (4.062) [-11.372; 4.553]	4.110 (4.881) [-5.457; 13.678]	-4.174 (2.861) [-9.782; 1.433]	-0.193 (3.636) [-7.321; 6.933]	-1.875 (3.429) [-8.596; 4.845]	0.704 (4.100) [-7.332; 8.741]

Notes: ***, **, and * signify statistical significance at p-value < 0.01, 0.05, and 0.1; (...) is the generated standard errors whereas [...] is the 95% confidence interval.

Author contributions: Delphin Kamanda Espoir conceived the key ideas for this research paper. He collected and analysed the data. He also worked on the introduction, methodology, and discussion of the results. Benjamin Mudiangombe worked on the methodology, data analysis, and discussion of the results. Frank Bannor worked on data compilation and analysis and wrote the conclusion of the paper. Regret Sunge and Jean-Luc Mubenga worked on the introduction and literature review of this research paper. Softwares: DK. Espoir and B. Mudiangombe. The two authors have read and approved the final version of this manuscript.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest. The School of the University of Johannesburg and the Department of Economics, Munhumutapa School of Commerce, Great Zimbabwe University had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript, and in the decision to publish the results.

References

- Abid, M. (2016). Impact of economic, financial, and institutional factors on Co2 emissions: Evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa economies. *Utilities Policy*, 41, 85–94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jup.2016.06.009>
- Abidoye, B. O., & Odusola, A. F. (2015). Climate change and economic growth in Africa: An econometric analysis. *Journal of African Economies*, 24(2), 277–301. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jae/eju033>
- Adebayo, T. S., & Kirikkaleli, D. (2021). Impact of renewable energy consumption, globalization, and technological innovation on environmental degradation in Japan: application of wavelet tools. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, March. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-021-01322-2>
- ACPC. (2020). Climate Change Is an Increasing Threat to Africa. <https://unfccc.int/news/climate-change-is-an-increasing-threat-to-africa>. Accessed 24 June 2021.
- Adzawla, W., Sawaneh, M., & Yusuf, A. M. (2019). Greenhouse gasses emission and economic growth nexus of sub-Saharan Africa. *Scientific African*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sciaf.2019.e00065>
- Aguiar-Conraria, L., Azevedo, N. & Soares, M. J. (2008). Using wavelets to decompose the time–frequency effects of monetary policy. *Physica A Statistical Mechanics and Its Applications*, Volume 387, p. 2863–2878.
- Akram, N. (2013). Is climate change hindering economic growth of Asian economies? *Asia-Pacific Development Journal*, 19(2), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.18356/e7cfd1ec-en>
- Alagidede, P., Adu, G., & Frimpong, P. B. (2014). *WIDER Working Paper 2014 / 017 The effect of climate change on economic growth Evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa*. January.
- Al-Mulali, U., & Che Sab, C. N. (2012). The impact of energy consumption and Co2 emission on the economic growth and financial development in the Sub Saharan African countries. *Energy*, 39, 180–186.
- Aloui, C., Hkiri, B., Hammoudeh, S. & Shahbaz, M. (2018). A Multiple and Partial Wavelet Analysis of the Oil Price, Inflation, Exchange Rate, and Economic Growth Nexus in Saudi Arabia. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade*, 54(4), pp. 935–956.

- Aye, G. C., & Edoja, P. E. (2017). Effect of economic growth on Co2 emission in developing countries: Evidence from a dynamic panel threshold model. *Cogent Economics and Finance*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322039.2017.1379239>
- Baarsch, F., Granadillos, J. R., Hare, W., Knaus, M., Krapp, M., Schaeffer, M., & Lotze-Campen, H. (2020). The impact of climate change on incomes and convergence in Africa. *World Development*, 126, 104699. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.104699>
- Berkeley Earth. (2021). Global Temperature Report for 2020. <http://berkeleyearth.org/global-temperature-report-for-2020>. Accessed 26 June 2021.
- Bersvendsen, T., Ditzen, J., 2021. Testing for slope heterogeneity in Stata. *The Stata Journal*, 21(1), 51-80.
- Bouznit, M., & Pablo-Romero, M. d. (2016). Co2 emission and economic growth in Algeria. *Energy Policy*, 96, 93-104.
- Chang, T., Gupta, R., Inglesi-Lotz, R., Simo-Kengne, B., Smithers, D., & Trembling, Amy. (2015). Renewable energy and growth: Evidence from heterogeneous panel of G7 countries using Granger causality. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, Elsevier, 52(C), 1405-1412
- Chekouri, S. M., Chibi, A., & Benbouziane, M. (2021). Economic growth, carbon dioxide emissions and energy consumption in Algeria: a wavelet coherence approach. *World Journal of Science, Technology and Sustainable Development*, 18(2), 172–189. <https://doi.org/10.1108/wjtsd-12-2020-0097>
- Dell, M., Jones, B. F., & Olken, B. A. (2012). Temperature shocks and economic growth: Evidence from the last half century. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 4(3), 66–95. <https://doi.org/10.1257/mac.4.3.66>
- Demissew Beyene, S., & Kotosz, B. (2020). Testing the environmental Kuznets curve hypothesis: an empirical study for East African countries. *International Journal of Environmental Studies*, 77(4), 636–654. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207233.2019.1695445>
- Espoir, D. K., Ngepah, N., 2021. Income distribution and total factor productivity: a cross-country panel cointegration analysis. *International Economics and Economic Policy* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10368-021-00494-6>
- Espoir, K., & Sunge, R. (2021). Co2 Emissions and Economic Development in Africa: Evidence from A Dynamic Spatial Panel Model Co2. In *Econstor* (Issue May). <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.24275.09764>
- Espoir, K., Sunge, R., & Bannor, F. (2021). Economic growth and Co2 emissions: Evidence from heterogeneous panel of African countries using bootstrap Granger causality. In *Econstor, ZBW - Leibniz Information Centre for Economics* (Issue June). <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.35499.77606>
- Fang, Z., Huang, B., & Yang, Z. (2018). Environmental Kuznets Curve: Evidence from Cities in the People's Republic of. In *Asian Development Bank Institute* (Issue 882).
- FAO. (2019). *FAO'S Work on Climate change. United Nations Climate Change Conference 2019*. 1–40. <http://www.fao.org/3/ca7126en/ca7126en.pdf>
- Grinsted, Moore, C. & Jevrejeva. (2004). Application of the cross wavelet transform and wavelet coherence to geophysical time series. *Nonlinear Processes in Geophysics, European Geosciences Union (EGU)*, 11(5/6), pp. 561-566.
- Gorus, M. S., & Aydin, M. (2019). The relationship between energy consumption, economic growth, and Co2 emission in MENA countries: Causality analysis in the frequency domain. *Energy*, 168, 815-822
- Hallegatte, S., Bangalore, M., Bonzanigo, L., Fay, M., Kane, T., Narloch, U., Rozenberg, J., & David Treguer, and A. V.-S. (2016). *Shock Waves: managing the Impacts of Climate Change on Poverty* (Vol. 59, Issue 1). http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0022112081001535
- Holtermann, L., & Rische, M.-C. (2020). The Subnational Effect of Temperature on Economic Production: A Disaggregated Analysis in European Regions. *MPRA Working Paper*, 104606. <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/104606/> MPRA
- IMF. (2017). The effects of weather shocks on economic activity: How can low-income countries cope? *World Economic Outlook: October 2017, October*, 117–183.
- IMF. (2019). The Economics of Climate. *Finance & Development*, 4(54), 65. <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/2019/12/pdf/fd1219.pdf>
- IPCC. (2015). Summary for policymakers. In *Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups*

- I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Core Writing Team, R.K. Pachauri and L.A. Meyer (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, 151 pp.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139177245.003>
- Issartel, J., Bardainne, T., Gaillot, P., & Marin, L. (2014). The relevance of the cross-wavelet transform in the analysis of human interaction - A tutorial. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5(OCT), 1–18.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01566>
- Kahn, M., Mohaddes, K., Ng, R., Pesaran, M., Raissi, M., & Yang, J.-C. (2019). Long-Term Macroeconomic Effects of Climate Change. *IMF Working Papers*, 19(19). <https://doi.org/10.5089/9781513514598.001>
- Kalkuhl, M., & Wenz, L. (2018). The Impact of Climate Conditions on Economic Production. Evidence from a Global Panel of Regions. *Econstor, ZBW - Leibniz Information Centre for Economics*.
<http://hdl.handle.net/10419/178288%0AStandard-Nutzungsbedingungen>
- Kasperowicz, R. (2015). Economic growth and Co2 emissions: The ECM analysis. *Journal of International Studies*, 8(3), 91–98. <https://doi.org/10.14254/2071-8330.2015/8-3/7>
- Lanzafame, M. (2012). Temperature, rainfall and economic growth in Africa. *Empirical Economics*, 46(1), 1–18.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00181-012-0664-3>
- Lu, W.-C. (2017). Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Energy Consumption and Economic Growth: A Panel Cointegration Analysis for 16 Asian Countries. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 14(1436), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph14111436>
- Magazzino, C., Mutascu, M., Sarkodie, S. A., Adedoyin, F. F., & Owusu, P. A. (2021). Heterogeneous effects of temperature and emissions on economic productivity across climate regimes. *Science of the Total Environment*, 775(February), 145893. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145893>
- Munir, S., & Khan, A. (2014). Impact of Fossil Fuel Energy Consumption on Co2 Emissions: Evidence from Pakistan (1980-2010). *The Pakistan Development Review*, 53(4), 327–346.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/24398722>
- Newell, R. G., Prest, B. C., & Sexton, S. E. (2018). The GDP-Temperature Relationship: Implications for Climate Change Damages Climate Change Damages. In *Resources for the Future* (No. 18-17 REV; Issue November). [https://media.rff.org/archive/files/document/file/RFF WP-18-17-rev.pdf](https://media.rff.org/archive/files/document/file/RFF%20WP-18-17-rev.pdf)
- Ng, E. K. & Chan, J. C., (2012). Geophysical Applications of Partial Wavelet Coherence and Multiple Wavelet Coherence. *Journal of Atmosphere and Oceanic*, Volume 29, p. 1845–1853.
- Odhiambo, N. M. (2017). Co2 emissions and economic growth in sub-Saharan African countries: A panel data analysis. *International Area Studies Review*, 20(3), 264–272. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2233865917715943>
- Oduola, A., & Abidoye, B. (2020). Effects of temperature shocks on economic growth and welfare in Africa. *Resources and Environmental Economics*, 2(2), 158–171. <https://doi.org/10.25082/ree.2020.02.002>
- Olubusoye, O. E., & Musa, D. (2020). Carbon Emissions and Economic Growth in Africa: Are They Related? *Cogent Economics and Finance*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322039.2020.1850400>
- Omotor, D. G. (2016). *Economic Growth and Emissions: Testing the Environmental Kuznets Curve Hypothesis for Econas* (Issue 6).
- Omri, A., Daly, S., Rault, C., & Chaibi, A. (2015). Financial development, environmental quality, trade and economic growth: What causes what in MENA countries. In *Energy Economics* (Vol. 48, Issue 8868). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2015.01.008>
- Regional, U., For, B., Nations, U., Programme, D., Oduola, A., Nations, U., & Programme, D. (2017). *Challenges and Issues. December*.
- Rua, A. & Nunes, L. C. (2009). International comovement of stock market returns: A wavelet analysis. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, Volume 16, p. 632–639.
- Spagnolo, M. R. B. and N. (2012). Linear and Non-linear Causality between CO2 Emissions and Economic Growth Published by: International Association for Energy Economics Stable URL:
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/23268093>. *The Energy Journal*, 33(3), 23–38.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/23268093>
- The Economist Intelligence Unit. (2020). Resilience to climate change? A new index shows why developing countries will be most affected by 2050. *The Economist*.
https://www.eiu.com/public/topical_report.aspx?campaignid=climatechange2019

- Torrence, C. & Compo, G. P. (1998.) A Practical Guide to Wavelet Analysis. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, Volume 79, p. 61–78.
- Torrence, C. & Webster, P. J. (1999). Interdecadal Changes in the ENSO–Monsoon System. *Journal of Climate*, Volume 12, p. 2679–269.
- WHO. (2018). Climate change and health. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/climate-change-and-health>. Accessed 25 June 2021.
- WMO - World Meteorological Organization. (2020). *Global Climate Report - August 2020 | State of the Climate*. <https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/sotc/global/202008>
- World Meteorological Organization. (2020). *State of the Climate in Africa-2019* (Issue WMO-No. 1253). World Meteorological Organization.
- WRI. (2020). Climate. 4 Charts Explain Greenhouse Gas Emissions by Countries and Sectors. <https://www.wri.org/insights/4-charts-explain-greenhouse-gas-emissions-countries-and-sectors>. Accessed 25 June 2021.
- Yusuf, A. M., Abubakar, A. B., & Mamman, S. O. (2020). Relationship between greenhouse gas emission, energy consumption, and economic growth: evidence from some selected oil-producing African countries. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 27(13), 15815–15823. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-020-08065-z>
- Zaidi, S., & Ferhi, S. (2019). Causal Relationships between Energy Consumption, Economic Growth and CO₂ Emission in Sub-Saharan: Evidence from Dynamic Simultaneous-Equations Models. *Modern Economy*, 10(09), 2157–2173. <https://doi.org/10.4236/me.2019.109136>
- Zou, S., & Zhang, T. (2020). Co2 emissions, energy consumption, and economic growth nexus: Evidence from 30 Provinces in China. *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/8842770>