

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_125973
Title of the Manuscript:	A Fuzzy DANP Approach to Identifying and Ranking Factors Influencing Location of Renewable Energy Farms
Type of the 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>

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 manuscript is important for the scientific community because it provides a systematic approach for optimizing the location of renewable energy farms, a key aspect of sustainable energy development. By employing the fuzzy DANP method, the study addresses the complexity of decision-making in renewable energy siting, considering various criteria and their interdependencies. I appreciate the manuscript's integration of fuzzy logic and multi-criteria decision-making, which adds depth and rigor to the analysis. However, the paper could benefit from more detailed discussion on the practical implications of the findings to further strengthen its impact	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title is suitable as it accurately reflects the content of the paper. However, a slightly more descriptive alternative could be: " <i>Utilizing Fuzzy DANP to Rank Factors for Optimal Siting of Renewable Energy Farms.</i> "	
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 provides a comprehensive overview of the study, detailing the problem, significance, methodology, and main objective. However, it could be strengthened by including specific findings, such as the top-ranked factors or the implications of the results. This addition would give readers a clearer picture of the study's key outcomes.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript is logical, with clearly defined sections, including an introduction, literature review, research methodology, results, and conclusions. The flow is coherent, making the paper easy to follow.	
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 manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The use of the fuzzy DANP approach, which integrates the DEMATEL and ANP methods, is appropriate for addressing the complexity of locating renewable energy farms. The authors have provided a thorough literature review and demonstrated an understanding of the challenges in renewable energy siting. The methodology is well-detailed, and the analysis steps are clearly outlined, ensuring replicability.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references cited in the manuscript are sufficient and cover both recent and relevant studies. They include key works in renewable energy siting, multi-criteria decision-making methods, and fuzzy logic applications	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is mostly clear but could benefit from minor language editing for smoother readability.	
Optional/General comments	Consider including a brief discussion on how the findings can be applied to different geographical regions or types of renewable energy (e.g., wind, solar). Overall, the manuscript contributes valuable insights to the scientific community regarding the siting of renewable energy projects and decision-making processes.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ologe Solomon Ochuko
Department, University & Country	University Polytechnic of Catalonia Barcelona, Spain