



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_10710
Title of the Manuscript:	2-tuple prioritized aggregation operators and their application to multiple attribute group decision making
Type of the Article	Short Research 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This paper proposes some extended operators for 2-tuple linguistic term sets, such as the 2TPWA operator and the 2TPWG operator, and further applies these operators to MAGDM. This topic is very new and has many things to do. This paper is well written. Some modification should be made before acceptance. 1. At the last sentence of paragraph, please clarify (4). In addition, the virtual linguistic term sets must be added (see Xu (2004) information science). 2. At the end of paragraph 2, please delete some duplicate operators. 3. Page 3, line 3, "into on this issue" should be "into this issue". 4. Eq. (5) should be modified: C_i. 5. It is advised to add some explanation to g in Definitions 3.1 and 3.2. May be here should be $g+1$. 6. As you have proposed the 2TPWA operator and the 2TPWG operator, why not proposed the ordered weighted forms of them, such as the 2TPOWA and 2TPOWG operators and the hybrid forms. Only proposed two operators can not show enough significant of your paper. 7. Some potential references are suggested as follows: [1] Some new hybrid weighted aggregation operators under hesitant fuzzy multi-criteria decision making environment, Journal of Intelligent & Fuzzy Systems (2014) http://dx.doi.org/10.3233/IFS-130841. [2] Multiplicative consistency of hesitant fuzzy preference relation and its application in group	Many thanks for your value comments. 1. At the last sentence of paragraph, we have clarified (4). In addition, we have added the virtual linguistic term sets (Xu (2004) information science). 2. At the end of paragraph 2, we have deleted some duplicate operators. 3. Page 3, line 3, "into on this issue" has been changed into "into this issue". 4. Eq. (5) has been modified: C_i 5. "g" has been explained in Subsection 2.1. In Definitions 3.1 and 3.2, "g" has been changed into "g+1". 6. In future work, we will propose the ordered weighted forms of them, such as the 2TPOWA and 2TPOWG operators. 7. These references have been added to the revised version. 8. We have made some comparison between your operators with the other ones existed in the literature. The conclusion section has been enhanced.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	decision making, International Journal of Information Technology & Decision Making, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 47-76, 2014. [3] Distance and similarity measures for hesitant fuzzy linguistic term sets and their application in multi-criteria decision making, Information Sciences (2014) 271 (2014) 125-142. [4] H.C. Liao and Z.S. Xu, Automatic procedures for group decision making with intuitionistic fuzzy preference relations, Journal of Intelligent & Fuzzy Systems (2014) DOI:10.3233/IFS-141203. [5] Z.S. Xu and H.C. Liao, Intuitionistic Fuzzy Analytic Hierarchy Process, IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems (2014) doi: 10.1109/TFUZZ.2013.2272585. [6] H.C. Liao and Z.S. Xu, Priorities of intuitionistic fuzzy preference relation based on multiplicative consistency, IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems (2014) doi: 10.1109/TFUZZ.2014.2302495. 8. After giving the example, it is suggested to make some comparison between your operators with the other ones existed in the literature. The conclusion section is a little simple.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		