

## Review

# Research on the Role Mechanism of ESG Governance Model in the Capital Management of Global Manufacturing Enterprises

Xiaowu Huang<sup>1,\*</sup>
<sup>1</sup> Haier Electronics Group Co., Ltd., Hong Kong, China

\* Correspondence: Xiaowu Huang, Haier Electronics Group Co., Ltd., Hong Kong, China

**Abstract:** This review paper examines the role and mechanisms of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) governance models in the capital management of global manufacturing enterprises. We synthesize extant literature to explore how ESG factors influence financial performance, investment decisions, and risk management strategies within this sector. The review encompasses a historical overview of ESG integration in manufacturing, followed by a detailed analysis of how ESG practices impact access to capital, cost of capital, and capital allocation efficiency. We further investigate the challenges and opportunities associated with implementing robust ESG governance frameworks in diverse manufacturing contexts. Through comparative analysis of different ESG governance approaches, the paper identifies best practices and proposes avenues for future research, emphasizing the importance of standardized metrics and transparent reporting to enhance the effectiveness of ESG initiatives in driving sustainable value creation for global manufacturing enterprises.

**Keywords:** ESG; Governance; Capital Management; Manufacturing; Sustainability; Investment; Risk Management

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Background and Motivation

The global manufacturing sector is increasingly recognizing the significance of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) factors. Stakeholders, including investors and consumers, are demanding greater transparency and accountability regarding manufacturers' ESG performance. This shift has profound implications for capital management, influencing investment decisions, cost of capital, and access to funding. Effective capital management, represented by variables such as  $ROA$  and  $ROE$ , is crucial for sustainable growth in this context. Therefore, understanding how ESG governance models impact capital management within global manufacturing enterprises is paramount. This research is motivated by the need to elucidate the role mechanism of these models, providing insights for improved decision-making and enhanced long-term value creation [1].

### 1.2. Research Objectives and Scope

This paper aims to investigate the impact of ESG governance models on capital management within global manufacturing enterprises. Specifically, we analyze how different ESG strategies affect key financial metrics like cost of capital ( $k$ ), investment efficiency ( $I$ ), and risk-adjusted return on capital ( $RAROC$ ). The scope encompasses publicly listed manufacturing firms across diverse sectors, focusing on environmental ( $E$ ), social ( $S$ ), and governance ( $G$ ) factors as defined by leading ESG rating agencies.

### 1.3. Structure of the Review

This paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 reviews relevant literature on ESG, capital management, and their intersection. Section 3 details the research methodology, including data sources and the model specification for analyzing the role of ESG in capital

Received: 12 July 2026

Revised: 24 August 2026

Accepted: 06 September 2026

Published: 10 September 2026



**Copyright:** © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

management, focusing on variables such as *ROA* and *Tobin's Q*. Section 4 presents and discusses the empirical findings [2]. Finally, Section 5 concludes with key findings, limitations, and future research directions.

## 2. Historical Overview of ESG in Global Manufacturing

### 2.1. Early Stages of Environmental Awareness

The nascent stages of ESG in global manufacturing were largely defined by a growing awareness of environmental degradation caused by industrial processes. Early concerns centered on pollution control, resource depletion, and the impact of manufacturing activities on local ecosystems [3]. Landmark events, such as the 1972 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm, catalyzed international cooperation and spurred the development of environmental regulations. The rise of environmental protection agencies (EPAs) in various countries marked a significant milestone, leading to the enforcement of standards for air and water quality. These initial regulations primarily focused on end-of-pipe solutions, aiming to mitigate the immediate environmental impact of manufacturing rather than fundamentally altering production processes [4]. The concept of sustainable manufacturing was still in its infancy, with economic growth often prioritized over environmental stewardship (Table 1).

**Table 1.** Timeline of Key Environmental Regulations in Manufacturing

| Year         | Event                                                          | Description                                                                                   | Impact                                                                                                               |
|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1972         | United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (Stockholm) | Catalyzed international cooperation and spurred the development of environmental regulations. | Increased global awareness of environmental issues related to manufacturing.                                         |
| Early Stages | Rise of Environmental Protection Agencies (EPAs)               | EPAs in various countries enforced standards for air and water quality.                       | Led to the enforcement of environmental standards and regulations in manufacturing.                                  |
| Early Stages | Initial Environmental Regulations                              | Primarily focused on end-of-pipe solutions.                                                   | Mitigated the immediate environmental impact of manufacturing, but did not fundamentally alter production processes. |

### 2.2. Expansion to Social and Governance Factors

The initial focus on environmental impact within manufacturing gradually broadened to encompass social and governance (ESG) factors. This expansion recognized that long-term sustainability required addressing issues beyond environmental protection. Social considerations, such as labor practices, worker safety, and community engagement, gained prominence. Simultaneously, governance structures, including board composition, ethical conduct, and transparency in reporting, became integral to evaluating a manufacturing enterprise's overall ESG performance [5]. Investors and stakeholders increasingly demanded accountability across all three pillars, recognizing their interconnectedness and impact on long-term value creation. The shift reflected a growing understanding that responsible manufacturing necessitates a holistic approach, where environmental stewardship, social responsibility, and sound governance are inextricably linked, influencing factors like *ROI* and *risk* (Table 2).

**Table 2.** Evolution of ESG Focus in Manufacturing

| Stage          | Focus                                       | Key Considerations                                                                                                               | Impact on Business                                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Initial Focus  | Environmental Impact                        | Pollution reduction, resource conservation                                                                                       | Cost reduction (e.g., energy efficiency)                                                         |
| Expanded Focus | Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) | Environmental protection, labor practices, worker safety, community engagement, board composition, ethical conduct, transparency | Long-term sustainability, improved <i>ROI</i> , reduced <i>risk</i> , enhanced stakeholder value |

### 2.3. Current Trends and Integration

Current trends in ESG integration within global manufacturing demonstrate a move towards standardized practices. International standards, such as those from the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) and the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB), are increasingly adopted to ensure comparability and transparency in ESG reporting. The Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) recommendations are also gaining prominence, pushing companies to assess and disclose climate-related risks and opportunities [6]. Furthermore, investors are actively incorporating ESG factors into their investment decisions, driving demand for robust and reliable ESG data. This trend encourages manufacturers to improve their ESG performance and disclosure to attract capital and maintain competitiveness in the global market. The variable  $x$  represents the ESG score [7].

## 3. ESG and Access to Capital

### 3.1. Impact on Investor Sentiment and Capital Flows

Strong ESG performance significantly shapes investor sentiment, acting as a powerful magnet for capital flows into global manufacturing enterprises. Investors increasingly perceive companies with robust ESG practices as less risky and more sustainable in the long term. This perception stems from the belief that such companies are better equipped to navigate regulatory changes, manage operational risks, and capitalize on emerging market opportunities related to sustainability [8].

Positive ESG ratings and disclosures can enhance a company's reputation, fostering trust among investors and stakeholders. This increased trust translates into higher demand for the company's stock and bonds, leading to improved access to capital at potentially lower costs [9]. Conversely, poor ESG performance can trigger negative investor sentiment, resulting in divestment and increased scrutiny, ultimately hindering access to funding. The relationship can be quantified where ESG performance is positively correlated with the capital inflow  $C$ , such that  $\frac{dC}{dESG} > 0$ . Therefore, ESG considerations are becoming integral to investment decisions, driving capital towards manufacturing firms demonstrating a commitment to environmental stewardship, social responsibility, and good governance [10].

### 3.2. ESG Ratings and Investment Decisions

ESG ratings agencies play a crucial role in shaping investment decisions by providing assessments of companies' environmental, social, and governance performance [11]. These ratings act as signals to investors, influencing their perception of a manufacturing firm's risk profile and long-term sustainability. Higher ESG ratings generally correlate with increased investor confidence, leading to a greater willingness to invest capital. Conversely, low ratings can deter investors, limiting access to funding [12].

The impact of ESG ratings on capital availability is particularly pronounced for manufacturing firms, which often face scrutiny regarding their environmental impact and labor practices. Investors increasingly use ESG ratings to screen potential investments, allocating capital towards companies demonstrating strong ESG performance. This trend

creates a competitive advantage for firms with high ratings, enabling them to attract a wider pool of investors and potentially secure more favorable financing terms, such as lower interest rates on loans or higher valuations for equity offerings. The relationship can be modeled as:  $Capital \propto ESG_{rating}$ , where *Capital* represents the amount of capital available to the firm and  $ESG_{rating}$  is the firm's ESG rating (Table 3).

**Table 3.** Comparison of ESG Rating Agencies Criteria

| Criteria               | Environmental (E)                                                                                                 | Social (S)                                                                                                                                      | Governance (G)                                                                                                                      | Impact on Capital Availability                                                                                                                                    |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Focus                  | Environmental impact of operations and products; resource usage; pollution; climate change risk; carbon footprint | Labor practices; human rights; product safety; data security; community relations; stakeholder engagement                                       | Corporate governance structure; board composition; executive compensation; ethical behavior; transparency; risk management          | Directly impacts investor confidence and willingness to invest. Higher ESG ratings generally lead to greater capital availability. $Capital \propto ESG_{rating}$ |
| Manufacturing Example  | Reducing emissions from factories; minimizing waste generation; using sustainable materials                       | Ensuring fair wages and safe working conditions for employees; avoiding human rights abuses in supply chains; contributing to local communities | Implementing strong corporate governance policies; ensuring board diversity; preventing corruption; disclosing ESG performance data | Higher $ESG_{rating}$ leads to increased <i>Capital</i> and potentially lower cost of capital. Low ratings may restrict access to funding.                        |
| Investment Implication | Favoring companies with lower carbon footprints through investments in renewable energy.                          | Supporting companies with robust labor standards and ethical supply chains.                                                                     | Investing in companies with independent boards and transparent reporting practices.                                                 | ESG scores are now significant factors in evaluating prospective investment decisions.                                                                            |

### 3.3. Green Bonds and Sustainable Financing

Green bonds have emerged as a crucial instrument for manufacturing companies seeking to finance environmentally sustainable projects. These bonds, where proceeds are earmarked for green initiatives, allow companies to tap into a growing pool of investors focused on ESG factors. The appeal lies in the transparency and accountability associated with green bonds, requiring issuers to report on the environmental impact of the funded projects.

Beyond green bonds, sustainable financing encompasses a broader range of instruments, including sustainability-linked loans (SLLs). SLLs incentivize companies to achieve specific sustainability performance targets, with interest rates tied to their success. For manufacturing firms, these targets might include reductions in carbon emissions ( $CO_2$ ), water usage ( $H_2O$ ), or waste generation ( $W$ ). The adoption of such instruments signals a commitment to ESG principles, potentially enhancing a company's

reputation and attracting socially responsible investors. Furthermore, access to capital markets can be improved as investors increasingly prioritize companies demonstrating strong ESG performance.

#### 4. ESG and Cost of Capital

##### 4.1. ESG Performance and Risk Reduction

Strong ESG performance is increasingly recognized as a crucial factor in mitigating operational and regulatory risks for global manufacturing enterprises. Robust environmental practices, for example, can reduce the likelihood of costly environmental accidents and subsequent fines, thereby lowering operational risk. Similarly, strong social performance, encompassing fair labor practices and community engagement, minimizes the risk of labor disputes and reputational damage, further contributing to operational stability. Effective governance structures, characterized by transparency and accountability, reduce the risk of corruption and mismanagement, enhancing investor confidence.

These risk reductions directly translate into a lower cost of capital. Investors perceive companies with strong ESG profiles as less risky investments, demanding a lower risk premium. This decreased risk premium manifests as a lower required rate of return on equity ( $k_e$ ) and debt ( $k_d$ ). Consequently, the weighted average cost of capital (WACC) decreases, making it cheaper for the company to finance its operations and investments. This ultimately enhances the company's financial flexibility and long-term sustainability.

##### 4.2. Impact on Debt Financing Costs

ESG factors are increasingly recognized as significant determinants of debt financing costs for global manufacturing enterprises. Lenders are incorporating ESG considerations into their credit risk assessments, leading to differentiated pricing based on a firm's ESG performance. Companies with strong ESG profiles are often perceived as lower risk, benefiting from reduced interest rates and more favorable loan terms. This is because robust ESG practices can mitigate operational risks, enhance reputation, and improve long-term financial stability, thereby lowering the probability of default.

Sustainability-linked loans (SLLs) represent a growing trend in debt financing, where interest rates are tied to the achievement of pre-defined sustainability performance targets. For manufacturing firms, these targets may include reductions in carbon emissions, improvements in waste management, or enhancements in worker safety. SLLs incentivize companies to improve their ESG performance, further reducing their risk profile and potentially leading to lower debt financing costs. The interest rate adjustment, denoted as  $\Delta i$ , is often linked to key performance indicators (KPIs) related to ESG metrics. Failure to meet these targets can result in a higher interest rate, while exceeding them may lead to a discount (Table 4).

**Table 4.** Examples of Sustainability-Linked Loans in Manufacturing

| Feature            | Description                                                                                        | Example KPI                                                                   | Impact on Interest Rate ( $\Delta i$ )                                                                               |
|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Emission Reduction | Loan terms tied to reducing carbon emissions from manufacturing processes.                         | Percentage reduction in Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions per unit of production. | Meeting the reduction target results in a lower interest rate; failure to meet it results in a higher interest rate. |
| Waste Management   | Loan terms linked to improvements in waste reduction, recycling, and circular economy initiatives. | Percentage increase in waste recycled or diverted from landfills.             | Achieving a higher recycling rate lowers the interest rate; not meeting the target increases it.                     |

|                   |                                                                                         |                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                   |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Worker Safety     | Loan terms associated with improvements in worker safety and health metrics.            | Reduction in the number of workplace accidents or lost-time injuries.            | Significant reduction in accidents leads to a lower interest rate; an increase or failure to improve increases the interest rate. |
| Energy Efficiency | Loan terms linked to reductions in energy consumption during the manufacturing process. | Percentage improvement in energy efficiency per unit of output, measured in kWh. | Meeting energy efficiency goals lowers interest rate; not reaching them raises the rate.                                          |
| Water Usage       | Loan terms associated with reducing water consumption in production.                    | Reduction in litres of water used per unit made.                                 | Improved water use results in lower interest rate; opposite result leads to higher rate.                                          |

#### 4.3. Equity Valuation and ESG Integration

ESG integration significantly influences equity valuation by affecting both expected future cash flows and the cost of equity capital. Companies with strong ESG profiles may experience enhanced operational efficiency, reduced regulatory risks, and improved brand reputation, leading to higher projected earnings and, consequently, increased equity value. Conversely, poor ESG performance can signal potential liabilities, operational disruptions, and reputational damage, negatively impacting future cash flow expectations and depressing equity valuation.

The cost of equity capital, often estimated using models like the Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM), is also affected. The CAPM equation,  $r_e = r_f + \beta(r_m - r_f)$ , suggests that ESG factors can influence both the beta ( $\beta$ ) and the market risk premium ( $r_m - r_f$ ). Companies with robust ESG practices may exhibit lower systematic risk, resulting in a lower beta and a reduced cost of equity. Furthermore, investors increasingly demand a premium for investing in companies with poor ESG records, effectively increasing the market risk premium for those firms. This ultimately impacts the discount rate used in equity valuation models.

## 5. Comparison of ESG Governance Models and Challenges in Global Manufacturing

### 5.1. Different ESG Governance Structures

Different ESG governance structures significantly impact a manufacturing enterprise's ability to integrate sustainability into its capital management. Board-level oversight, where the entire board or a designated committee holds responsibility for ESG, ensures that ESG considerations are embedded in strategic decision-making. This approach provides strong accountability. Alternatively, dedicated ESG committees, often composed of cross-functional experts, offer specialized knowledge and focused attention on ESG issues. The effectiveness of each structure depends on factors such as company size, industry, and the level of ESG integration desired. Some firms adopt a hybrid model, combining board oversight with a dedicated committee to leverage both strategic direction and specialized expertise. The choice of structure influences resource allocation, risk management, and ultimately, the impact of ESG on capital management strategies.

### 5.2. Challenges in Implementation

Implementing robust ESG governance in global manufacturing faces significant hurdles. Data availability and measurement inconsistencies pose a major challenge. Standardized metrics for environmental impact (E), social responsibility (S), and governance practices (G) are often lacking, hindering accurate performance assessment and benchmarking across different regions and industries. Furthermore, the complexity of global supply chains makes it difficult to trace and verify ESG compliance at all tiers.

Varying regulatory landscapes and cultural contexts also necessitate tailored approaches, increasing the cost and complexity of implementation. The need for specialized expertise and resources, particularly in developing economies, further exacerbates these challenges.

### *5.3. Addressing the Challenges*

Addressing the challenges inherent in ESG governance requires multifaceted strategies. Overcoming data scarcity necessitates investment in comprehensive data collection and standardized reporting frameworks. Mitigating greenwashing risks demands enhanced transparency and independent verification of ESG claims. Addressing stakeholder conflicts involves establishing clear communication channels and robust grievance mechanisms. Furthermore, the complexity arising from diverse regulatory landscapes can be managed through proactive engagement with policymakers and the development of adaptable ESG policies. Finally, securing long-term commitment requires integrating ESG metrics into executive compensation and fostering a culture of sustainability throughout the organization, ensuring that ESG considerations are embedded in all aspects of capital management, where  $ESG = f(\text{Transparency}, \text{Data}, \text{Stakeholder Engagement})$ .

## **6. Future Perspectives and Research Directions**

### *6.1. Standardization and Transparency*

A critical area for future development lies in the standardization and transparency of ESG metrics. The current landscape suffers from a lack of universally accepted definitions and measurement methodologies, hindering meaningful comparisons between companies and industries. Greater standardization would allow for more accurate benchmarking and facilitate the flow of capital towards genuinely sustainable enterprises. Enhanced transparency in ESG reporting is equally crucial. Companies should provide detailed and verifiable data on their ESG performance, enabling investors and stakeholders to make informed decisions. This includes clear disclosure of the methodologies used to calculate ESG metrics and the assumptions underlying these calculations. Increased transparency reduces the risk of greenwashing and promotes accountability, ultimately strengthening the effectiveness of ESG initiatives in driving positive change. The variable  $x$  could represent a standardized ESG score.

### *6.2. Technological Innovation and ESG*

Technological innovation offers significant opportunities to improve ESG practices within global manufacturing. Artificial intelligence (AI) can automate the collection and analysis of vast datasets related to environmental impact, social responsibility, and governance structures, leading to more accurate and timely ESG reporting. Blockchain technology can enhance transparency and traceability in supply chains, verifying ethical sourcing and reducing the risk of greenwashing. Furthermore, AI-powered predictive models can identify potential ESG risks and opportunities, enabling proactive capital allocation decisions. The integration of these technologies can drive more sustainable and responsible manufacturing practices, ultimately improving long-term financial performance and stakeholder value. Future research should explore the optimal implementation strategies and the impact of these technologies on various ESG metrics, such as CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and worker safety.

### *6.3. Future of ESG Investing*

The future of ESG investing appears poised for significant growth and transformation. We anticipate a shift towards more standardized and transparent ESG reporting frameworks, reducing ambiguity and facilitating easier comparison across companies. Technological advancements, particularly in data analytics and AI, will likely play a crucial role in refining ESG risk assessment and investment strategies. Furthermore, the integration of ESG factors into mainstream financial models is expected to deepen, influencing asset allocation decisions and potentially leading to a lower cost of capital for companies with strong ESG performance. The increasing demand from both institutional

and retail investors for sustainable investment options will further propel the expansion of the ESG market, driving innovation and ultimately contributing to a more responsible and sustainable global economy. The variable  $x$  representing ESG investment will see a positive correlation with long-term returns.

## 7. Conclusion

### 7.1. Summary of Key Findings

This review highlights the crucial role of ESG governance in global manufacturing enterprises' capital management. Effective ESG models positively influence access to capital, reduce the cost of capital ( $c$ ), and improve investment efficiency ( $I$ ). Strong ESG practices also mitigate risks ( $R$ ) and enhance long-term financial performance ( $P$ ).

### 7.2. Implications for Practice and Policy

The findings suggest manufacturing firms should integrate ESG into capital management, attracting investors prioritizing sustainable practices. Policymakers should incentivize ESG adoption through regulations and subsidies, fostering a resilient manufacturing sector. Integrated strategies enhance long-term value and mitigate risks associated with  $E$ ,  $S$ , and  $G$  factors.

## References

1. A. Kumar, T. King, and M. Ranta, "Corporate governance characteristics and involvement in ESG activities: current trends and research directions," *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, vol. 24, no. 8, pp. 175-209, 2024.
2. S. N. Kuznetsova, V. P. Kuznetsov, Z. V. Smirnova, N. S. Andryashina, and E. V. Romanovskaya, "Corporate governance in the ESG context: A new understanding of sustainability," in *\*Ecological Footprint of the Modern Economy and the Ways to Reduce It: The Role of Leading Technologies and Responsible Innovations\**, Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2024, pp. 53-57.
3. L. K. David, J. Wang, V. Angel, and M. Luo, "Environmental commitments and innovation in China's corporate landscape: an analysis of ESG governance strategies," *Journal of Environmental Management*, vol. 349, 119529, 2024.
4. O. Mooneepapen, S. Abhayawansa, and N. Mamode Khan, "The influence of the country governance environment on corporate environmental, social and governance (ESG) performance," *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 953-985, 2022.
5. Y. Yu, L. Wang, Y. Wu, J. Z. Zhang, H. Li, and Y. Zhang, "How ESG governance affects total factor productivity: Evidence from Chinese listed companies," *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, vol. 116, 108074, 2026.
6. U. Anathole, C. Limei, and F. Hamza, "Navigating corporate greenwashing in the carbon era: synergizing internal carbon pricing, ESG governance, and regulatory stringency to advance environmental integrity," *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 2025.
7. P. Câmara, "The systemic interaction between corporate governance and ESG," in *The Palgrave Handbook of ESG and Corporate Governance*, Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2022, pp. 3-40.
8. T. T. Yeh, Y. Xiao, and S. J. Daniel, "Stakeholder influences on management control systems for ESG governance and reporting in the global automotive industry," *Journal of Corporate Accounting & Finance*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 103-120, 2024.
9. R. Müller, M. A. Caron, N. Drouin, J. Lereim, R. Alonderienė, A. Chmieliauskas, ... and R. Šuminskienė, "Governance of ESG implementations: governance dimensions and their structural implementation," *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 118-138, 2025.
10. A. Tan, "The integrated ESG pathways model: advancing ESG governance in pluralistic legal systems," Available at SSRN 5170737, 2024.
11. Z. Baharom, "The role of internal audit in ESG governance: a conceptual framework," *International Journal of Research and Innovation Social Science*, vol. IX (2454), pp. 947-953, 2025.
12. K. Albitar, K. Hussainey, N. Kolade, and A. M. Gerged, "ESG disclosure and firm performance before and after IR: the moderating role of governance mechanisms," *International Journal of Accounting & Information Management*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 429-444, 2020.

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of Publisher and/or the editor(s). Publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.