



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_44774
Title of the Manuscript:	On application of two- stage stochastic fully fuzzy linear programming for water resources management optimization
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>)

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. The abstract is poorly written. It has several grammatical errors, e.g., In this paper, a management of water resources is investigated based on a two-stage stochastic fully fuzzy linear programming. The problem having various scenarios of policy associated with economics penalties of different levels. These two sentences are grammatically wrong. 2. The author should send the paper for proofreading and correction, before resending it for review. As it is, there are too many grammatical errors. 3. Citations are not done according to APA 6th or 7th Edition. Author should consult any of this APA editions and correct the citations/references in the paper	In this paper, a two- stage stochastic fully fuzzy linear programming is developed for a management problem in terms of water resources allocations to illustrate the applicability of a proposed approach. A proposed approach convert the problem into a triple- objective problem and then a weighting method is utilized for solving it. The advantage of the approach is to generate a set of solutions for water resources planning which help the decision maker to make tradeoffs between the efficiency of economic and the risk violation of the constrains. A case study is given for illustration.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) No	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	No	
If plagiarism is suspected, <u>please provide related proofs or web links.</u>	No	