

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_126338
Title of the Manuscript:	Forecasting natural gas production in different countries by a fractional grey Bernoulli model
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal’s peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of ‘**lack of Novelty**’, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This article will help the other researchers to move forward choosing the appropriate model for natural gas production. Conclusion cannot be made by using one evaluation metric. There are many evaluation metrics for forecasting. So other evaluation metrics can be used to substantiate the accuracy of the models.	Thank you for your suggestion. I chose the Mean Absolute Percentage Error (MAPE) as the primary evaluation metric due to its advantages, including ease of interpretation, applicability to data of varying scales, emphasis on relative error, and sensitivity to outliers. While I primarily used MAPE, I will consider incorporating additional evaluation metrics, such as Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) and Mean Absolute Error (MAE), in subsequent analyses to enhance the comprehensiveness of the model evaluation.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Predicting Natural Gas Production in Various Nations Using a Fractional Grey Bernoulli Approach	Thank you for your review and suggestions regarding my study. I have revised the title to the suggested “Predicting Natural Gas Production in Various Nations Using a Fractional Grey Bernoulli Approach” based on your feedback. I believe this title better reflects the core content of the research.
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is ok.	Thank you for your suggestion.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	1) Review of Literature is missing . 2) The heading for methodology subsection can be changed. For ex) Algorithm itself means steps . so not necessary to give it as algorithm step . Similarly the headings in methodology can be reconsidered. 3) In methodology there is no mention of the way the data is preprocessed and the parameters that are taken from the dataset. 4) Fig 4 comes under Case 2 but it is given in Case 3 section.	1) Thank you for your feedback. I appreciate your observation regarding the review of literature. I have now included a more comprehensive literature review that highlights relevant studies and theories related to my research. This addition aims to provide a stronger theoretical framework and context for the study. Your input has been instrumental in improving the quality of the work. 2) Thank you for your review and suggestions regarding my study. Based on your feedback, I have removed the subheading “Algorithm Steps” and merged it with the section on “Optimization algorithm solves nonlinear parameters” This modification aims to improve the coherence and readability of the content. 3) I appreciate the reviewer’s review and feedback on my study. I

Review Form 3

		would like to clarify that the dataset I used has been rigorously screened and cleaned during collection, so no further preprocessing is necessary. This is why I did not specifically mention it in the methodology. I would like to clarify the point you raised regarding the lack of data preprocessing and parameter explanation. In my research, the parameters in the methodology are derived from the optimization algorithm rather than being initially extracted from the dataset. When the optimization algorithm optimizes the parameter γ , the parameters a and b can be calculated based on mathematical theory. I have supplemented this process in the methodology section. 4) Thank you for pointing out the error regarding Fig. 4. I have made the necessary adjustments and placed Fig. 4 correctly in the “Case 2” section. I appreciate your thorough review and valuable suggestions for my study.
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The various models are compared with different datasets from different nations. This adds value to the article. The main drawback here is only MAPE is calculated and conclusion is made. this may not give the best accuracy when other evaluation metrics are used. So, my suggestion is to go for other evaluation metric and then do the remaining.	Thank you for your suggestion. I chose the Mean Absolute Percentage Error (MAPE) as the primary evaluation metric due to its advantages, including ease of interpretation, applicability to data of varying scales, emphasis on relative error, and sensitivity to outliers. While I primarily used MAPE, I will consider incorporating additional evaluation metrics, such as Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) and Mean Absolute Error (MAE), in subsequent analyses to enhance the comprehensiveness of the model evaluation.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Yes the references are sufficient. Reference 10 is too old (1984) and could’ve been avoided	Thank you for your review and suggestions regarding my research. I understand your concern about the older references. However, this particular work is one of the foundational theories for my study, providing important concepts and frameworks. While there are more recent studies available, I will further explore these updated references in my revision to ensure the comprehensiveness and relevance of my research.
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes it is understandable but can be improved	Thank you for your suggestion.
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	