

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_96416
Title of the Manuscript:	A Hybrid Model Based on Grey Wolf Optimizer and Lagrangian Support Vector Regression for European Natural Gas Consumption Forecasting
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1, This is an interesting topic on the natural gas consumption problem under complex conditions. It is worthy of investigation. This manuscript used two nonlinear auto-regressive approaches to train, check and predict the problem. The prediction accuracy of five mainstream approaches is evaluated and the best performance model is identified. 2, the current title can exactly reflect the context. Keep it. 3, Abstract: In the background part, it is better to not mention the Russia-Ukraine war in a technical paper although this is an important cause. The political policy can be input through your data. 4, Generally, the structure of the manuscript is good. The current dataset covered up to May 2022. The effect of the local politics may be not strong. More recent data can be included to check the model prediction capacity. 5, This is a good try and sound research. 6, References seem too old. Only two papers are within 3 years. Updating some recent references can help you well define the research problem and latest progress of your method. I have no particular suggestion on the recent related reference list. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jianguo Wang
Department, University & Country	China University of Mining and Technology, China