

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_129577
Title of the Manuscript:	Pioneering Greenfield Energy Development Strategies Aligned With Global Carbon Reduction and Climate Goals
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: 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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Review of the Manuscript, “Pioneering Greenfield Energy Development Strategies Aligned With Global Carbon Reduction and Climate Goals”</p> <p>The paper tackles an important and relevant problem: How Greenfield energy projects help global efforts to reduce carbon emissions. It covers many topics, like rules and laws, new technology, and how different groups get involved. However, the paper needs to dig deeper into several key areas to meet research standards.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> No Defined Methodology: The most significant error is the lack of explanation of how conclusions were made. Research papers require clear methodologies when drawing their conclusions. <p>Suggestion: Add a methodology section that describes how data was collected and analyzed. It might include a literature review procedure, case study analysis, or statistical evaluation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Generalization Without Facts: Most of the arguments made in the paper are well-meaning but unsupported by evidence or facts. This gives the arguments lesser credibility and makes the paper less reliable. <p>Suggestion: Where possible, include data, case studies, or examples to support arguments. For instance, mention some Greenfield energy projects that have succeeded or failed and elaborate on why this is so.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Superficial Stakeholder Engagement: The paper acknowledges the role of stakeholders but does not go into details about their roles or conflicts. Recommendation: Analyze the relationships between governmental agencies, private companies, and local communities more intensively. Explain the causes of conflicts and how they can be resolved. Use case studies to support this analysis. Lack of Global and Regional Comparisons: The paper does not seriously try to compare the different strategies of different regions or countries towards Greenfield projects. <p>Suggestion: Compare and contrast the analysis. For instance, how do developed countries manage financing, technology, and regulations for such projects compared to developing ones?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Surface-Level Financial and Technological Discourse: No critical analysis of feasible problems or real solutions is presented in these finance and technology sections. <p>Suggestion: Obstacles facing large upfront capital outlays, intellectual property concerns and required infrastructure upgrades should be overcome. Stress new financial tools like green bonds, blended finance, or new high-tech products that would facilitate progress. The paper does not seem to have a clear, structured format. It is difficult to differentiate between background information and findings or discussion.</p> <p>Overall Suggestion: This paper lays a good groundwork but needs more depth, proof, and structure to count as a research paper. To make it better:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - state research questions and use them to guide the paper's narrative. - Add a comprehensive section on methodology. - Support arguments with data, real examples, and case studies. - Look closer at roles of different stakeholders, financial difficulties, and how things differ by region (developed and developing countries). - Use a more formal structure to separate facts from analysis. <p>These changes can turn the paper from a well-thought-out essay into a research-based work that adds value to the field of clean</p>	

Review Form 3

	energy. Note: the paper contains more than 45% percent of AI text. The reviewer want to remain anonymous and has requested that the identity not be disclosed.	
--	---	--

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:	Irom Prabin Meitei
Department, University & Country	Mizoram University, India