

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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 significant for the scientific community as it addresses a critical issue: the identification and ranking of factors influencing the location of renewable energy farms, which is crucial for the sustainable development of energy infrastructure. The use of the fuzzy DANP approach adds value by offering a robust decision-making framework to manage the uncertainties and interdependencies between criteria, providing a more comprehensive evaluation. I appreciate the manuscript's relevance, especially given the increasing global focus on clean energy transitions. It offers practical insights for policymakers and developers in optimizing site selection for renewable energy, potentially accelerating the adoption of renewable energy technologies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title "A Fuzzy DANP Approach to Identifying and Ranking Factors Influencing Location of Renewable Energy Farms" is suitable for the article. It clearly communicates the methodology (Fuzzy DANP) and the focus (identifying and ranking factors influencing the location of renewable energy farms). The title is concise, specific, and relevant to the subject, making it appealing to researchers and professionals interested in renewable energy site selection and decision-making processes.	
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 of the article is generally comprehensive, as it provides a clear overview of the research problem, the importance of renewable energy site selection, and the methodology used (the fuzzy DANP approach).	
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.	This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound due to its use of the fuzzy DANP approach, which is a well-established decision-making tool for handling uncertainties and interdependencies between criteria. By applying this approach to the location selection of renewable energy farms, the study addresses a complex real-world problem with a method that is capable of providing more accurate and reliable results in uncertain environments. The use of fuzzy logic ensures that the study accounts for the vagueness inherent in decision-making processes, while the integration of the DANP method allows for a systematic ranking of factors. Overall, the combination of a strong theoretical framework with practical application makes the manuscript scientifically rigorous and relevant to the field of renewable energy site selection.	

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Somarouthu V G V A Prasad
Department, University & Country	Pithapur Rajah's Government College (A): KAKINADA, India