



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_23247
Title of the Manuscript:	The Classification of Alternatives based a Multi-criteria Analysis Technique and the Combination of AHP and the Weighted Sum
Type of the Article	Method Articles

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 <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The paper is good and presents an interesting solution for multi-criteria problems. However, I strongly suggest the authors to better explain the proposal. Even though the article has no relevant problems, it is quite difficult to read it because of so many formulas and very few explanatory text. In this sense I would like the authors to improve the quality of the paper by adding new explicative texts rather than focus mainly in formulas.	We have added new explicative texts, and we rewrite the abstract, introduction to explain the idea Thank you for your suggestions.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	A revision of the English is advisable.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		