

Table S2 - Summary of Methodological Characteristics of Composite Sustainability Indices in the Electricity and Energy Sector

| Author(Year) | Category / Focus | Geography | Scope | Method | Weighting / Normalization | Key Indicators Used | Key Limitations |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------|--|--|---|---|---|
| Prokhorova, Budanov & Budanov (2024) | Generalized integrated indicator for energy safety (ZNPP case) | Ukraine | Industrial power-generation enterprise | Indicative analysis + AHP + expert estimation automated monitoring | Expert weighting; + normalization through analytic hierarchy consistency checks | Energy security, reliability, operational risk, staff competency, equipment condition | Limited external data validation; sample restricted to one enterprise (ZNPP); heavy reliance on expert scoring for weight calibration |
| Cavallaro (2015) | Fuzzy Environmental Pressure Index (FEPI) for electricity generation | Italy | Energy technology-specific | Mamdani-type Fuzzy Inference System | Linguistic rules; membership-based fuzzification; centroid defuzzification | Air pollution, radiation, water/soil contamination, health impact | Uses qualitative membership functions; lacks empirical calibration with real emission data |
| Qian et al. (2024) | EEBD-3ES model – Energy, Economy, Environment, Social impacts of coal reduction | China | National-provincial level | Hybrid AHP + Entropy Weight + Scenario Simulation | Entropy for data-driven weights; AHP for qualitative adjustment | Economic output, employment, emissions, social welfare, trade | Model complexity and dependence on scenario assumptions; limited sensitivity testing on weight shifts |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|----------------|--|--|--|---|---|
| Neofytou, Nikas & Doukas (2020) | Sustainable Energy Transition Readiness (SETR Index) | Greece & EU | Cross-country EU states) (14 | Hybrid PROMETHEE II + AHP | AHP for weights; preference functions for ranking | Governance, innovation, infrastructure, policy, finance, technology | Temporal limitation (single-year data); expert sample size moderate (n≈15) |
| Raza, Janajreh & Ghennai (2014) | Sustainability Index for energy storage system selection | Pakistan / UAE | Technology-level comparison (fuel cell vs Li-polymer vs lead-acid) | Weighted Sum MCDA | Expert-assigned weights; range normalization | Technical, economic, environmental, and lifecycle | Limited indicator breadth (3 techs only); subjective weighting without validation |
| Goldrath, Ayalon & Shechter (2015) | Combined Sustainability Index for electricity efficiency measures | Israel | National energy efficiency policy | MCDA (five sub-index model) | Equal weights; normalized across dimensionless scores | Economic, environmental, technological, social, political | Static dataset (single-year snapshot); equal weights not empirically justified |
| Liu (2014) | General Sustainability Indicator (conceptual synthesis + review) | China | Global conceptual framework | Literature synthesis + fuzzy AHP conceptualization | Weighted aggregation (illustrative); discusses AHP/entropy | Environmental, economic, social, institutional, technical | Conceptual—no primary data or model testing; no reproducibility metrics |
| Wang et al. (2020) | Fuzzy evaluation for transition reliability in Integrated | China | System-level (IES) | Multi-level Fuzzy Comprehensive Evaluation | Combined empowerment (AHP + Entropy) | Reliability, economy, environment, safety | Case-specific data from one IES; no comparative benchmark validation |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| | Energy Systems (IES) | | | | | | | |
| Wu et al. (2021) | Low-carbon transition performance assessment | China | Regional / national | Improved TOPSIS + Entropy | Entropy-based objective weights; Euclidean normalization | Carbon intensity, renewable share, energy efficiency | Uses annual cross-sectional data; no stakeholder verification | |
| Raza et al. (2014, early version) | Preliminary sustainability index for energy storage | UAE | Technological prototype | Weighted MCDA | Sum | Equal weighting (pilot model) | Technical, cost, and environmental | Prototype iteration without peer benchmarking; lacks uncertainty treatment |
| Afgan (2010)Afgan | Conceptual / energy systems | Europe (EU) | Conceptual design of Intelligent Energy Systems using ICT for sustainability assessment | MCDA (Multi-criteria Decision Analysis)with additive weighted index | | Weighted arithmetic mean; normalization of multi-dimensional indices; fuzzy set membership functions | Economic (Investment, O&M, Electricity cost), Environmental (CO ₂ , Air pollution, Particulates), Social (Acceptability, Job creation), Resource (Material use, Recycling) | No empirical data validation; limited stakeholder participation; theoretical model only; assumes perfect data availability |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|--|---|--|--|---|
| Cucchiella et al. (2017) cucchiella2017 | Quantitative / Empirical | 28 EU countries | Country-level sustainability benchmarking (Environment Energy) | AHP + MCDA + hybrid using Eurostat datasets | Pairwise comparison matrix normalized (Saaty scale); CR<0.1 ensures consistency | 9 indicators: GHG emissions, Government Env. Expenditure, Recycled WEEEs, Recycled MSW, Renewable share (electricity, transport, heating), Primary Energy Efficiency | Limited to environmental Recycled ELVs, Recycled and energy pillars (no social/economic); snapshot year (2013); relies on expert survey consistency |
| Torul Yürek et al. (2024) | Multi-objective optimization of national energy system with battery storage | Turkey | National-level planning (2022–2030) | MOLP + Pythagorean Fuzzy AHP–TOPSIS integrated MCDM | AHP-derived weights for criteria; entropy consistency within fuzzy set; normalization via linear scaling | 4 criteria (Economic, Technological, Social, Environmental); Sub-indices: Sustainability Index (SI), Socio-Political Index (SPI), Cost/LCOE, Emission reduction, Job creation, Policy incentives | SI and SPI partially rely on expert judgment from Cost/LCOE, earlier models; limited stakeholder diversity; short-term projection (2022–2030) |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------|--|---|---|---|---|
| Ospina Betancur et al. (2022) | Relationship between economic/so cial growth and energy development | Colombia | National macroeconomic | Multivariate statistical analysis(correlatio n, dispersion matrices, pictorial graphs) | Standardization for variance control; no weighting scheme | Economic (GDP, industry, consumption), Social (employment, education, life quality), Energy (generation, access, consumption) | Purely correlational; lacks predictive modeling or aggregation; single-year cross-sectional |
| Mainali & Silveira (2015) Mainali Silveira Using aSustainabi... technologies | Sustainabilit y index for rural electrificatio n | India | Techno-socio comparison of 10 systems (2005–2015) | PCA-based ETSI composite index | Z-score standardization + principal components weight | Economic (cost, efficiency), Social (job creation, acceptance), Environmental (emissions) | Static index (no dynamic interactions); expert validation limited |
| Ordu Soytaş (2015) ordu20 15 | Energy commodity– market interaction | Turkey | Pre/post-2008 financial crisis | VAR & Granger causality | Log-normalized returns | Oil, Gas, Electricity prices vs stock indices | No sustainability dimension; short sample period |
| Sarkodie & Adams (2020) Sarkodi e | Electricity access vs HDI and inequality | Sub-Saharan Africa | 26 countries (2000–2018) | Driscoll–Kraay panel regression | Cross-country normalization of HDI & access indices | Electricity access, Governance, Inequality, HDI | Limited qualitative stakeholder data |
| Shah et al. (2019) shah20 19 | Energy Security + Environment al Sustainabilit y Index (ESESI) | South Asia | 8 countries (2006–2017) | Composite MCDA | Min–max normalization + equal weights | Energy imports, RES share, CO ₂ , efficiency | Equal weight bias; no economic pillar |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Yumashev et al. (2020) | HDI vs energy consumption and CO ₂ | Global (UN/OECD dataset) | Cross-country macro study | Econometric regression | PPP adjustment | HDI, GDP, CO ₂ , energy share | No MCDA or weighting structure |
| Zieleński & Jonek-Kowalska (2021) | CSR vs profitability in energy companies | Poland | Firm-level (2009–2019) | Descriptive comparative financial analysis | + Ratio normalization | ROA, ROE, EPS, CSR index membership | CSR definition narrow (only stock index) |
| Yan et al. (2020) | Industrial quality capacity index for smart energy meters | China | Sectoral (technical benchmarking) | MCDA + PCA verification | Principal component weights | Standardization, inspection, metrology, R&D | Industrial scope only; no social context |
| Reyer et al. (2017) | Climate change impact meta-assessment | Latin America & Caribbean | Regional multi-sectoral | Meta-analysis of model outputs | Comparative normalization | GDP loss, temperature, agriculture, water stress | Synthesizes secondary data; not original index |
| Konara et al. (2021) | Energy transition policy evaluation | Sri Lanka | National contextual study | Indicative framework analysis | Qualitative scoring | Renewable target, policy readiness | Limited quantitative validation |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| Stein (2013) | Global energy development and sustainability trends | Global | 120 countries (1980–2012) | Comparative quantitative trend analysis + macro-indicator correlation | Normalized by GDP and population; no weighting | Energy intensity, CO ₂ per capita, renewable share, GDP growth, electricity access | No formal index; lacks normalization across sustainability pillars; limited statistical modeling |
| Doukas et al. (2012) | EU Energy Policy Index | EU-27 | Policy performance of member states | MCDA (AHP + expert scoring) | Expert weights; normalization [0–1] | Efficiency, environment, tech readiness, security | Subjectivity in expert weights; limited temporal data |
| Ediger et al. (2007) | Fossil Fuel Sustainability Index (FFSI) | Global (62 countries) | Fossil fuel dependency and sustainability | Composite index, PCA weighting | Equal & PCA weights; 0–1 scaling | R/P ratio, P/C ratio, CO ₂ intensity | Lacks socio-economic context; only fossil metrics |
| Falbo et al. (2010) | Electricity Market Index (FAST) | Spain & Germany | Electricity spot price dynamics | Quantitative simulation, Axiomatic Index Theory | Weighted averages vs axiomatic structure | Price volatility, market manipulation risk, hedging efficiency | Not a sustainability index; no environmental dimension |
| Kılıkış (2018) | Urban sustainability benchmarking (SDEWES Index) | South-East Europe (18 cities) | City systems – energy, water, environment | MCDA + Monte Carlo Simulation | Normalized (0–5 scale); equal weights | 35 indicators across 7 dimensions (energy, water, waste, air, transport, governance, economy) | Data availability heterogeneity across cities |
| Neelawela et al. (2019) | Electricity security index | Global (14 countries) | 25-year historical analysis | Composite Index Construction | Entropy weight + Normalization (0–1) | Affordability, reliability, efficiency, environmental impact | Small sample of countries limits global representativeness |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Neves & Leal (2010) | Local energy sustainability planning | Portugal (EU case) | Municipal energy plans | Indicator framework + pilot testing | Equal weights; normalized scale | 18 indicators – supply mix, CO ₂ , efficiency, access | No quantitative aggregation or composite score |
| Abu-Rayash & Dincer (2021) | Energy sustainability and resilience | Global (203 countries) | 1990-2019 panel analysis | MCDA + Entropy Weight + Index Aggregation | Normalized to [0, 1]; entropy weights | Energy security, efficiency, access, renewables | Does not fully capture institutional stability |
| Abubakar et al. (2015) | Energy and development index | Nigeria | National | AHP + Entropy Hybrid MCDA | Weighted sum (0–1) | Energy use, GDP growth, social development | Small data sample; expert bias in AHP |
| Brown et al. (2007) | Energy security evolution | USA | National policy framework | Indicator trend analysis | Normalized trends | Availability, affordability, efficiency, environment | Descriptive; no composite aggregation |
| De Vito et al. (2017) | Renewable integration efficiency | EU-28 | National energy performance | Entropy Weight + TOPSIS | Entropy weights; Euclidean distance | Renewables share, emissions, cost, innovation | Static snapshot; lacks long-term validation |
| Huang et al. (2020) | Provincial energy transition index | China (31 provinces) | Regional transition readiness | Fuzzy Comprehensive Evaluation | Entropy weights + Fuzzy membership | Economic, technical, environmental dimensions | Subjectivity in fuzzy membership grading |
| Iddrisu & Bhattacharyya (2015) | Energy development index | Sub-Saharan Africa | National | Composite indicator method | Equal weights (0–1 scaling) | Electricity access, per capita use, CO ₂ | Missing data for rural areas |
| Kemmler & Spreng (2007) | Energy sustainability index | India | National energy system | MCDA + Indicator Normalization | Equal weights (0–1 scale) | Equity, security, environment | No time-series updating mechanism |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|--------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Patlitzianas et al. (2008) | Renewable energy readiness index | Mediterranean / EU | Policy infrastructure readiness | Policy and Regression indicator scoring | Normalization to [0–1]; regression-based weights | Policy, investment, R&D, renewable share | Data comparability limits cross-country synthesis |
| Razmjoo et al. (2019) | Sustainable Energy Development Index (SEDI) | Iran | National energy sustainability | AHP + Entropy + COPRAS | Hybrid weighting; normalized 0–1 | Economic, environmental, technical, policy | Limited to national context |
| Salarvand et al. (2010) | Provincial energy sustainability ranking | Iran (regional) | Sub-national | TOPSIS (MCDA) | Distance-based normalization | Efficiency, energy intensity, access | Static, lacks temporal dynamics |
| Sharma et al. (2019) | Energy transition readiness | South Asia | Regional | Entropy + Grey Relational Analysis | Entropy weights; grey normalization | Energy access, renewables, cost, emissions | Minimal qualitative stakeholder engagement |
| Tsai (2010) | Energy sustainability via national indicators | Taiwan | National | PSR framework + Weighted sum | Weighted aggregation; PSR-based normalization | Supply, consumption, CO ₂ emissions, renewables | Only two explicit energy indicators in TSDI |
| Vera & Langlois (2007) | UN energy sustainability framework | Global | Methodological template | Indicator development & standardization | None (conceptual benchmark) | Accessibility, efficiency, environment, affordability | No empirical case data |
| Wang et al. (2020) | Dynamic energy security | China | National time-series (1990–2017) | Functional Data Analysis + Entropy | Dynamic functional weighting | Energy supply, consumption, environmental | Complexity limits replication |

| | index (DESI) | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Zhong et al. (2020) | Sustainable urbanization index | China (East, Central, West) | Urbanization & regional disparities | Entropy weighting + Survey analysis | Entropy-based weights; standardized z-scores | Economic, social, ecological, rural-urban heterogeneity | Survey biases; administrative disparities | |
| Mayer et al. (2004) | Multidisciplinary review of sustainability indices (ecological, economic, thermodynamic) | Global conceptual | Cross-disciplinary taxonomy of indices | Narrative review + comparative framework | N/A | Resilience, carrying capacity, green income, exergy | No empirical data; purely conceptual | |
| Narula & Reddy (2015) | Comparison of energy security and sustainability indices | Global (100+ countries) | Benchmark index comparison | Indicator decomposition & correlation analysis | Normalization (0–1), rank aggregation | ESI, IIESR, EAPI country scores | Dependent on secondary datasets | |
| Romero & Linares (2014) | Exergy-based sustainability indicator framework | Global conceptual | Energy system efficiency and thermodynamic balance | Systematic review + theoretical model | N/A (thermodynamic ratios) | Physical & chemical exergy, irreversibility loss | Difficult to operationalize for policy | |
| Shortall & Davidsdottir (2017) | National energy sustainability | Iceland | National policy assessment | Expert interviews + comparative index analysis | Qualitative scoring vs OECD/IISD criteria | Affordability, equity, environment, efficiency, security | Limited quantitative data integration | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|----------------------|
| | y performance | | | | | | | |
| Streimikiene & Siksneliute (2016) | Electricity market sustainabilit y | 12 OECD countries | Market liberalization and sustainability performance | Linear regression + MCDA | Weighted comparative (Economic/Social/Env .) | Affordability, competitiveness, intensity, equity | CO ₂ | Static year snapshot |