

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_100115
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative Study of Proposed Ranking Method and Robust Ranking Method in Fuzzy Transportation Problem
Type of the Article	Research Paper

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Maybe</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. No</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Most</p> <p>6. No</p> <p>Additional comments:</p> <p>While the topic is interesting, there are several issues that need to be addressed before publication can be considered.</p> <p>Firstly, the abstract lacks a clear statement of the problem being addressed, the contribution made, and the results achieved. It would be helpful to clearly state the research question, the methods used to address it, and the main findings of the study.</p> <p>Secondly, the paper lacks a clear and coherent structure. The introduction does not provide a clear motivation for the study, nor does it provide a clear overview of the paper's content. The background section provides some useful context but lacks focus, while the methodology section is unclear and poorly structured. The results section is presented in a confusing manner, and the conclusion fails to provide a clear summary of the study's main findings.</p> <p>Thirdly, the paper lacks clarity in the presentation of the ranking methods being compared. The paper would benefit from a clear and concise description of each method and its underlying assumptions. The comparison between the methods should be presented in a more structured and systematic manner, with clear criteria for evaluating their performance.</p> <p>Finally, the paper lacks a clear discussion of the limitations of the study and avenues for future research. It would be helpful to discuss the limitations of the ranking methods used and their applicability to different types of fuzzy transportation problems. Additionally, a more detailed discussion of the potential for future research in this area would help readers understand the paper's contribution to the field.</p> <p>Overall, the paper requires major revisions before it can be considered for publication. Please address the issues raised above and consider revising the paper to provide a clearer and more coherent presentation of the study's main findings and contributions.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Xingsi Xue
Department, University & Country	School of Computer Science and Engineering, Fujian University of Technology, China