

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_110970
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative Study on Suitability of AHP and TOPSIS for Identifying optimal Conceptual Design of Bearing Puller
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>		
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	1.Suggest changing the title to: The Fusion Reasearch of AHP and TOPSIS for Identifying optimal Conceptual Design of Bearing Puller. 2.Apply AHP to the importance analysis of various sub functional indicators in conceptual design, Apply the topsis method to conceptual design to calculate the relative closeness of each alternative solution to the ideal solution, Determine which functions need to be prioritized and which functions need to be modified or changed first through evaluation and analysis. 3.Revise the logical expression of the relevant content of the paper according to the idea of modification suggestion 2. 4.The ideas and tools used to generate the results of Table 12 scoring table should be clearly expressed in the text, and the basis and rationality of expert selection should be explained in the text. 5.The conclusion of Part 5 needs to closely follow the research content to obtain research conclusions, and point out other factors that need to be considered for the integration of AHP and TOPSIS methods, and which aspects still need improvement and enhancement. 6. Inconsistent format of references	Author feel since the two methods are used separately there is no need to change the title to fusion This is very correct when the two methods will be hybridized together but, in this case, they want to be compared. Hybridizing AHP and TOPSIS is a good Multiattribute decision model because their methods are different Since the aim of the article is not to hybridized the two model, then it is not necessary to change logical expression of the paper content Table 12 is the Saaty scale for pairwise comparison. It is a general table that is just applied. Since it is a general table author feel since readers in the field of AHP already knows about the table, it is not necessary to start explanation on it. The current conclusion follows the aim and objectives of the research content of the work. since the aim of the work is not to integrate the AHP and TOPSIS then it is not necessary to change the conclusion Corrected. The alphabets in the year of the references have been removed

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	