Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Energy Research and Reviews**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JENRR_117020**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Application of Multilayer Perceptron with Residual Learning for Medium-term Forecasting of U.S. Fossil Energy Consumption**
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)

Review Form 1.7

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 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.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	1. **I consider that the document is a good contribution to the scientific community, there are things to improve in the document but they are minor, very satisfactory the comparison between the models.** 2. **yes, I think that sums up what was done in the document** 3. **yes, yes, however if I could give a little more general detail of the findings and how they are relevant for research and for the energy community** 4. **yes, the document complies with the traditional standards of scientific text editing** 5. **yes, I consider that the document is correctly written and structured as a scientific document** 6. **The current references are OK, however to be able to add a revision of the following: https://doi.org/10.32479/ijeep.15021** **https://doi.org/10.32479/ijeep.14380** 7. **I consider that sections 4.4 and 5.0 should be expanded a little more, they should be according to the entire process carried out, according to the results found and the improvements that this research may have in the future**	
Minor REVISION comments 1. **Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	yes, this is correct	
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Christian Manuel Moreno Rocha
Department, University & Country	Universidad de la Costa, Pais