

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_118781
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of a Novel approach for subsea pipeline failure analysis: A combined Fuzzy Analytic Hierarchy Process (FAHP) and Simple Addictive Weight (SAW) method.
Type of the Article	

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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, in most cases, only one method is employed. By integrating these two methods, this paper offers a novel perspective on meticulous failure analysis.</p> <p>2. Here are three alternative titles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhancing Subsea Pipeline Reliability: A Combined FAHP and SAW Approach for Multi-Criteria Decision-Making. Integrating Fuzzy Logic and Weighted Sum: A Novel Approach to Subsea Pipeline Failure Analysis. A Novel Hybrid Method for Subsea Pipeline Failure Analysis: Fuzzy Analytic Hierarchy Process and Simple Additive Weighting. </p> <p>3. Indeed, a more comprehensive examination is necessary to fully comprehend the interconnections between the various elements of this paper.</p> <p>4. Further improvements to the methodology and the results & discussion section are necessary in addition to a more detailed and coherent discussion.</p> <p>5. Affirmative, provided that the manuscript is revised in a manner that enhances its reliability and credibility, as per the recommendations of the reviewers.</p> <p>6. It is recommended that references from the previous decade be utilized in order to guarantee the paper's content is both pertinent and current.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There remain numerous instances of the English language that are not associated with a formal context. In this regard, it is recommended that the scientific writing style be adhered to in order to enhance the overall quality of the document.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. The introduction section fails to identify the purpose of this paper, and there is no evidence that an appropriate research gap has been addressed.</p> <p>2. The data utilized in the methods section is not readily apparent. For instance, the dimensions of pipes, routes of pipes, materials used in pipes, and examples of failures to be studied are not visible. Additionally, please provide an explanation of the significance of the <i>DE</i>, <i>WI</i>, <i>C</i>, and <i>F</i> parameters, which are the subject of our current investigation.</p> <p>3. It would be beneficial to provide a comparison between the combination of FAHP-SAW and FAHP or SAW alone. This would allow for a clear understanding of the effectiveness of the combination compared to the stand-alone method.</p> <p>4. Please add the title of Section 3.1 Results, as it was not found.</p> <p>5. In Section 3.2, please expand upon the findings discussed, as they are currently quite limited. This is essential for readers to gain sufficient information from this paper.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fuad Mahfud Assidiq
Department, University & Country	Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia