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

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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.**	
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**	
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.**	
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.**	
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.**	
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**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes it is understandable but can be improved	
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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**J.Jasmine Christina Magdalene**
Department, University & Country	**Bishop Heber College, India**