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.	**1. The paper will be of great interest to the scientific community. 2. I like the paper because the methodology employed in the analysis is robust, and the results and conclusion are also useful. It is a well-arranged and structured paper. The results are very well spelt out for readers of the paper to compare with the discussion and conclusion.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**The title of the manuscript is very suitable for the scientific world.**	
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 comprehensive. However, I will suggest that the author include quantitative values of the results/findings in the abstract.**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**Yes**	
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 work's results and findings are correlated. The methodology employed is very appropriate, and it gave useful results for the forecast. However, the reviewed literature and past work seem inadequate. Therefore, I suggest that more related papers or journal papers be reviewed and added to the work.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	**References are not sufficient for this work. More related papers should be reviewed and added to this work.**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes	
Optional/General comments	A good work by the author of the manuscript.	

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:	**Kufre Jerome Udoudo**
Department, University & Country	**Nigeria**