

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.	<p>The author attempted to implement the MCDCM method to compare various puller design concepts. While the approach is promising, there are concerns about the scale and ratings, as the author mentioned using the same weights for both methods but details on weight calculation is missing. The overall script is a commendable effort, but it requires more technical substance,</p> <p>Related</p> <p>Yes</p>	
MAJOR REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Indicate the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed approach compared the related methods2. Weights for Topsis method is didn't shown anywhere3. Citations are shown in different styles4. In page No 5 factor 3 is repeated twice5. In Topsis method mention the scale and discuss about the rating system6. How did you prepare the priority matrix and what its consistency index7. The proposed approach is not new8. Sensitivity analysis to check the robustness of the primary findings has not been found9. I am sorry to say this I can see more AI content10. Design concepts limitations are not discussed11. Why Topsis method justify12. Fig 3 is Incomprehensible, explain properly	<p>This is included in the discussion section of the revised article The weights for TOPSIS method is shown in Table 11</p> <p>Numbering style is used all through the article Corrected</p> <p>Check first paragraph section 3.1 Check Table 13 Yes. It's a comparison of two multicriteria decision models Sensitivity analysis of the two methods is not necessary since they are not new methods</p> <p>The subject area is popular on the internet hence, there is possibility that the syntax of the writing may appear but the content of the idea is different</p> <p>the author feel it is not needed since that is not the aim of the paper</p> <p>The reason for TOPSIS is that since its method of operation is different from that of the AHP</p> <p>Figure 3 shows the factors and subfactors and the design concept in order to provide a framework for the elements of the decision process</p>

[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>	