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**

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.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**		
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	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Li Zong Min**
Department, University & Country	**Zhongyuan University of Technology, China**