Overall, this paper is a good work but it also needs a lot of improvements. I think the authors tried to squeeze too many things (sometimes different things) in a single paper. For this reviewer, the paper was easy to follow and understand but it needs to be modified. Nevertheless, reading the paper raised several questions for this reviewer, as follows:

1. What are the quantification and scaling factors you used in the fuzzy controller? What are the control surface for the fuzzy controller? The design of these parameters is essential to the performance of the controller. The authors cannot just say the fuzzy logic controller (FLC) is superior to the other controller according to the results without pointing out that both the two controller you used are optimally designed.

2. In the inference and decision making process, the authors only use 3*3 table instead of commonly used 7*7, why is that? Please elaborate why 3*3 is enough? Also, more details of the fuzzification, inference, decision and defuzzification process should be given.

3. The introduction needs to be rewrote. The authors are suggested to do a more thorough literature review. The introduction should explain the work that has been done so far by other researchers and clearly point out the uniqueness and benefits of the controller proposed by the authors. Why this controller is better than other controller? The main novelty of this paper should be listed at the end of introduction. For example, you can write the following sentences:

The following shortcomings relative to ?? can be identified in the previous research, which have been addressed in this paper:

a) Lack of ?? analyses to show the impact of ?? on ?? for the customers and utilities in [R1]–[R3],

The authors are invited to update the introduction and refer the following reference in the literature review:

a) A Centralized Smart Decision-Making Hierarchical Interactive Architecture for Multiple Home Microgrids in Retail Electricity Market, Energies 11 (11), 3144

b) Long-term decision on wind investment with considering different load ranges of power plant for sustainable electricity energy market, Sustainability 10 (10), 3811

c) Investment Incentives in Competitive Electricity Markets, Applied Sciences 8 (10), 2018

d) Smart transactive energy framework in grid-connected multiple home microgrids under independent and coalition operations, Renewable Energy 126, 95-106

4. The innovation of the work in this paper is not very sufficient. The authors are suggested to go another step to improve their controller.

5. The authors can compare their controller with a conventional controller, which can be good. But it would be better if the authors could compare their controller with other researcher's work as well, such as the fuzzy controller proposed by other researcher (e.g. fuzzy fractional order proportional–integral–derivative, fuzzy logic PID).

6. Please make sure that your abstract and conclusion are properly structured and proofread concerning English spelling and grammar. These sections should undergo significant linguistic check because this undermines your results. Some phrases should go into the introduction. This is abstract so it should be short and to the point. Some sentences are too long, and it would be worth your time to shorten it into several sentences. In some places the text should be revised to be more clear. Why
abstract has been divided into several paragraph? Abstract should be as only one paragraph starting with the general overview of the work, the proposed methodology and eventually the obtained results.

7. I think I am not convinced with the contribution of the paper. As mentioned by the authors, “levelized cost of energy” is the contributions of the paper. Since the coordinated control structure is modified to accommodate the minimum limit of the cost, the two mentioned contributions are essentially the same. The authors modified the coordinated control (which widely have been used in FLC control studies as in [3-5]) to satisfy the minimum limit of the cost (which itself has been widely introduced and utilized to participate in frequency regulation in [7]-[8]). Additionally, I believe that the FLC-PI controller does not add a contribution to the paper. It can be safely removed from the paper altogether (as it is not noted properly as the contribution of the paper by the authors in the last paragraph of introduction). So, it is fair to conclude that the only contribution of the paper is modifying the coordinated control to the objective function of a tracking problem.

8. Please, check for minor and major errors to improve the English language use and enhance the clarity of the written text. English is not particularly good, at least not good enough for publishing in this journal. There are several grammatical error. The authors are invited to rewrite the paper from the point of view of English language. All sentences should be written in passive format and not active voice. Please make every effort to correct errors and spelling mistakes. Most paragraphs were too long.

9. The author is encouraged to provide a greater depth of discussion about each figure and Table, improve the figure quality and modify the conclusion as well. The quality of all figures should be improved noticeably.

Related to the above comments, the structure of the paper needs to be reconsidered. In summary, the paper needs some crucial adjusts (or justifications about the aforementioned comments) to be acceptable for the next round review. Please carefully address, point-by-point, the issues raised in the comments appended above. You should also include a suitable rebuttal to any specific request for change that you have not made. Mention the page, paragraph, and line number of any revisions that are made.