

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_129577
Title of the Manuscript:	Pioneering Greenfield Energy Development Strategies Aligned With Global Carbon Reduction and Climate Goals
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript aptly prompts the urge to open up further research works with ambitious quest, to economically cut down costs of Greenfield energy development to fill the obvious renewable energy huge gap and possibly eradicate energy poverty that is prevalent in virgin locations among the poorer, developing economies. The needed robust and innovative strategy, as outlined in the abstract; pointedly aligns the smart ideas through policies and frameworks, with global carbon reduction, and United Nations Climate goals. The manuscript is timely, and scientifically relevant with renewable energy solutions and measures to mitigate the global impact of climate change that is ravaging and threatening a sustainable planet earth for man's existence.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Based on the content of the entire 166 words Abstract, I suggest this alternative title for the author; "Strategising Greenfield Energy Development Gap to Align With Global Carbon Reduction and Climate Goals" . It best suits the content and context of the abstract.	
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 entire length and breadth of the abstract comprehensively represents the contents and discussions of the article so, there is really, nothing more to add in the author's context. On the Keywords; 2 among the 6 keywords overlapped, marked red (typographical error I suspect). <i>Climate Change MitigationGlobal Collaboration.</i>	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Sure! The manuscript, in a very clear grammatical expression, scientifically and effectively prosecuted the concept of the global fight against climate change impact with ways and measures to control global warming within the acceptable targeted temperature ceiling of +1.5 degrees Celsius; from carbon emissions in consumption of fossil energy sources. It explained in full details (both in financial and social terms) the effective applications of policies, frameworks and procedures through the triple helix models (Academia, Industry and Government) to reduce carbon emissions, and achieve the global climate goals.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references (APA style) are much, although 42 in number, they however, deeply elucidated all the arguments and points the author was making. I suspect that the first two has wrong dates (2025) as marked red in my review.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the author (his grammatical command) attracted my attention. It is indeed very suitable for scholarly communication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Very satisfactory conduct.	

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:	Chuba Sunny Nwachukwu
Department, University & Country	Onitsha Business School, Nigeria