# 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** |

<mark>**PART 1:**</mark> **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<br><br>1. **Is the manuscript important for scientific community?**<br>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)<br><br>2. **Is the title of the article suitable?**<br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)<br><br>3. **Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?**<br><br>4. **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?**<br><br>5. **Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?**<br><br>6. **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** | **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,**<br><br><br>**Related**<br><br>**Yes** | |
| **MAJOR** REVISION comments<br><br>1. **Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | YES | |
| **Optional/General** comments | 1. Indicate the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed approach compared the related methods<br>2. Weights for Topsis method is didn't shown anywhere<br>3. Citations are shown in different styles<br>4. In page No 5 factor 3 is repeated twice<br>5. In Topsis method mention the scale and discuss about the rating system<br>6. How did you prepare the priority matrix and what its consistency index<br>7. The proposed approach is not new<br>8. Sensitivity analysis to check the robustness of the primary findings has not been found<br>9. I am sorry to say this I can see more AI content<br>10. Design concepts limitations are not discussed<br>11. Why Topsis method justify<br>12. Fig 3 is Incomprehensible, explain properly | |

## Review Form 1.7

| | 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: | **Madhu K A** |
|---|---|
| Department, University & Country | **Reva University, India** |