



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_14586
Title of the Manuscript:	A fuzzy approach for solving three-level chance constrained quadratic programming problem
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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) Since the destination is to solve a three-level chance constrained programming problem, what is the relation between the three levels? Is the solution of the first level problem not the constraint of the second level? Similarly, is the solution of the second level is the constraint of the third level problem? I advise the authors to give more explanation on the question. (2) The last section should be rewritten. We can see that it is the same with the abstract. The authors should describe the conclusion, not just copy the abstract. (3) The computing results should be analyzed in detail in Section 5 to support your conclusion. But I can not find the analysis.	(1) In section 4 we said " one first convert the probabilistic nature of the constraints to equivalence deterministic constraints, after that gets the satisfactory solution that is acceptable to FLDM, and then gives the FLDM decision variable and goal with some leeway to the SLDM for him/her to seek the optimal solution, then the SLDM give the decision variables and goals with some leeway to the TLDM for him/her to seek the satisfactory solution and to arrive at the solution which is closer to the optimal solution of the FLDM. This due to, the TLDM who should not only optimize his/her objective function, but also try to satisfy the SLDM goals and preferences as much as possible, SLDM also do the same action to satisfy the FLDM goals and preferences as much as possible". That mean the third level decision maker should consider the satisfaction of the second level decision maker and the second level decision maker also considers the satisfaction of the first level decision maker, all the level under the first level should consider the satisfaction of the upper level by giving tolerance and sacrifice to satisfy the upper level decision makers we can see that in a structure which called hierarchical structure (2) ok sir it was rewritten as " In this paper three-level chance constrained quadratic programming problem(TLCCQP) is presented by using fuzzy approach wich is easy to apply and simple to be understood .



SDI Review Form 1.6

		After converting probabilistic nature of the constraints to equivalence deterministic constraints the FLDM solved his/her problem and give the individual best solution and individual worst solution by applying the simplex method, the SLDM solved his/her problem and give the individual best solution and individual worst solution by applying the simplex method, TLDM solved his/her problem and give the individual best solution and individual worst solution by applying the simplex method, after that the membership functions were created using the tolerance concept to develop Tchebycheff problem for generating Pareto optimal solution for this problem." (3) the computing result was analyzed clearly and all steps was written carefully, all results of δ, F_1, F_2 and F_3 were written in section 5
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Although I am not an English native speaker, I still firmly advise the authors to smooth the manuscript carefully. (1) "constrains" should be revised as "constraints" in the Abstract. And there are several such errors in the manuscript. (2) What is the last word in Line 5 of the abstract? It should be revised.	(1) The word "constrains" was replaced by "constraints" highlighted (2) It was "developTchebycheff" and revised to "develop Tchebycheff"
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	None	