

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_84240
Title of the Manuscript:	Bharat’s Solar Energy: An analysis using Porters Diamond Model with a brief on Ancient Past for Environmentally Sustainable Competitive Advantage
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljenrr.com/index.php/JENRR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	Using diamond model to explore the sustainable development of new energy development is an interesting topic. But the article has the following problems and suggestions: 1、 The conclusion of the article is not prominent, and the abstract and conclusion are not concise, resulting in the theme of the article is not clear, thus affecting the writing significance of the article. To summarize 2-3 specific conclusions and improve the core point of view. 2、 Data source and method are not clear, should be introduced in detail, or formula, thus affecting the scientific nature of the article. 3、 Some chapters are too simple, such as 2.1.6、 3.1 RESULTS ? 、 3.2 Discussion ? 4、 It is suggested to draw some charts based on the data of long sequences. 5、 References need to be arranged in order in the article : 1, 2, 3 . 6、 In the article, there are incomplete or incorrect expressions of words and sentences to strengthen grammar and smoothness of the article。	Reviewer comments are addressed with due respect without effecting the essence and meaningfulness of the papers research objective. 1.Appropriate changes are done in the abstract and conclusions for concise. 2.Data sources; required reference are placed from which data is drawn. As primary data is not collected, data sources are only other research studies. 3.Section 2.1.6. is deliberately left simple, to give enough scope to continue this research on solar energy and FDI policy of Bharat, however sufficient explanation is written also this is explained in limitations of the study. Section 3.1 presented with necessary results with proper discussion. 4.As data to support all arguments are presented in the main text, giving charts will lead to data redundancy. 5.References are re-arranged in the numerical order as suggested. 6.All sentences are checked and kept small as much possible to improve the readability. Simple language is used for easy to read and understand. Overall grammatical improvement is done. *** In all, to address the reviewer comments, 282 words have been worked on which are highlighted in yellow colour. Additionally, references are re-arranged and the new numerical order is placed in the text and in references section at the end of the paper.
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	