# Changes in response to reviewer comments

The reviewer comments are reproduced below, with our response given in bold italics below each point.

In addition to these changes recommended by the reviewers, some text (in particular in the Introduction) has been somewhat rewritten for increased clarity of presentation.

***Reviewer #1***

Comments to the Author

Comments on Manuscript Number: REF-D-22-00297 “Using Text Mining and Topic Modelling to Understand Success and Growth factors in Global Renewable Energy Projects”

1. The journal's guidelines should be followed by authors.

***This change has been made.***

2. SCI literature should be enhanced and summary should be given in text.

***This change has been made. We have included a new paragraph and rewritten some aspects of the text for better clarity.***

3.There is no well explanation what an essential difference appear between previous other/same reviews in this field. It would be recommended to list shortly the achievements of each of these books and papers etc.

***We have included some comments in relation to this point, but truthfully, what we are trying to demonstrate is that that topic modeling is something not generally undertaken within the renewable energy sphere. This is the novelty of our method. While there are authors who have used this method in the past, it has been only with reference to journalistic articles, and within a highly localized domain. The only other major review of this nature was by Bickel in 2019, where he reviewed renewable energy articles using topic modelling, but within sphere of materials science, (biological) process engineering, and (digital) monitoring and control systems sphere.***

***Therefore, while we are indeed writing a review paper of the work of others, we are doing it computationally and looking at social science factors (essentially building on the work of Bickel) and in a novel manner.***

4. Nomenclature list should be added/checked

***This change has been made.***