

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Energy Research and Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_129577
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Pioneering Greenfield Energy Development Strategies Aligned With Global Carbon Reduction and Climate Goals</b>
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.	This manuscript is highly relevant to the scientific, research & policy making community as it explores innovative strategies for aligning Greenfield energy developments with global decarbonization and climate goals. By addressing critical challenges such as financial risks, technological gaps, and regulatory barriers, the paper offers actionable frameworks that can guide the transition to sustainable energy systems. Its emphasis on renewable technologies, circular economy principles, and public-private partnerships provides valuable insights for both researchers and policymakers working towards carbon-neutral energy solutions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is thoughtful but lacks a strong action orientation. A more action-driven title would enhance its impact. I recommend something like: <b>Driving Decarbonization through Greenfield Energy Development Strategies to Achieve Global Climate Goals</b>	
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.	While the author has done a commendable job with the abstract, here are a few suggestions I feel that could further enhance its quality: 1. In the first line, instead of the generic term "international agreements," referring specifically to "the Paris Agreement" would provide stronger context and immediately anchor the abstract to a well-known framework. 2. In the second line, when defining Greenfield projects, the author should emphasize why they are uniquely suited for decarbonization. For instance, highlighting that these projects enable the development of modern, customized infrastructure free from legacy constraints would provide greater clarity and depth. 3. When describing challenges, including socio-environmental issues such as community resistance or biodiversity impacts would provide a more holistic perspective. 4. Adding relevant quantitative data, such as potential carbon reductions or economic impacts, would strengthen the abstract's credibility and appeal.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes the references are credible, sufficient and recent.	

### Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. However, some sentences are quite long and could be broken into shorter, more digestible parts for better clarity. The author should also focus on consistency of terminology.	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The author should also emphasise the critical role of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&amp;E) in the success of such projects. Many greenfield initiatives ultimately fail due to inadequate or ineffective M&amp;E practices. A high number of greenfield initiatives ultimately fail due to inadequate or ineffective M&amp;E practices. The paper lacks a discussion on monitoring and evaluation strategies to track the effectiveness of Greenfield energy projects after construction. Adding an M&amp;E framework would ensure projects meet their objectives and provide a feedback loop for continuous improvement.</li><li>2. While international and global knowledge-sharing models are promising, their implementation through Public-Private Collaboration (PPC) faces significant challenges. The involvement of governments from multiple countries often leads to bureaucratic delays, conflicting regulations, and misaligned priorities. Also, the author should note that different national policies on energy standards, environmental protections, and intellectual property rights complicate the harmonization of efforts across borders. The author must also consider that strategies or approaches that have proven effective in a developed country may not necessarily yield the same results in a developing country.</li></ol>	

### 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:	Shivank Goswami
Department, University & Country	India