

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The paper has developed an SVR-based model to predict the natural gas consumption. While the proposed model performs much better than the other models, the contribution of the paper is not strong enough as the proposed model is a simple combination of SVR and GWO. Therefore, clear explanation of the contribution is highly recommended.</p> <p>Besides, to improve the paper quality, I suggest the following major changes:</p> <p>1- Introduction and literature review parts need to be separated and expanded precisely. Introduction must present the importance of the work and literature section should explain the gap of the previous works separately.</p> <p>2- The quality of the figures, especially the first one, need to be improved.</p> <p>3- The implementation section needs to be improved by the following items: a) Find a reference paper for NGC forecasting and use its case studies and results as a benchmark. b) It is necessary to introduce other error measures such as RMSE and perform a confidence interval analysis.</p> <p>4- The paper is suffering from the lack of detailed discussion on the results.</p> <p>5- The diversity of the references is not sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<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:	Majid Abdollahzade
Department, University & Country	Azad University, Iran