

Dear authors,

The manuscript will require further work before it can be accepted for publication. In some sections, the structure used and the lack of information make the work somewhat confusing. Authors also need to revisit the author's instructions and revise their writing. For example, "methodology" and "Are" in lines 141 to 143.

Specific comments

1. Line 2- Please, PEDs in full.
2. The abstract must present the main information for the initial understanding of the article. There must be a balance of information so that all sections are adequately covered. In this case, the contextualization occupies a significant portion of the abstract, and the main findings were not explored. In addition, the methodology of the work needs to be better presented.
3. In keywords, acronyms after keywords will make search engines difficult. The best thing is to remove the acronyms or create specific keywords for the acronyms.
4. In the Introduction Section, the relevance, innovation, and contribution of the work need to be better presented.
5. The title of the illustrations contains explanations that must be transferred to the text.
6. Tables 4, 5, and 6 are confusing. Were only the green dark and green light criteria selected? In which part of the article were the "Criterion correspondents" presented? What is the relationship between the information in each line (for example, "Preferred Locations" and "Energy efficiency"? Note that Buildings has a varied audience with different backgrounds.
7. In the discussion section, the authors need to discuss the findings further and highlight the relevance of the results.
8. In the Conclusion section, the authors should better highlight the relevance of the results and limitations of the research.