



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_13430
Title of the Manuscript:	On The Solution of A rough Interval Three-level 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		
Minor REVISION comments	The paper is quite well written and, in my opinion, consists of a new material. However, the following technical changes should be done before the publication: - Title: A rough => a Rough - Abstract, lines 4, 5, 7: (QP) => QP - Introduction section, line 1: which described => which is described - Line 14: uncertainty here uncertainties => uncertainty. Here uncertainties - Line 3 from bottom: multi-objective under => multi-objective problem under - Page 2: which its bounds => which bounds - The statement "This paper is organized as follows:" should be written after the vertical space. - The whole manuscript: 2st => 2nd, 3st => 3rd - Page 4: UI problems given => UI of problems given - The statement after the formula (30) should be rewritten in the understandable form - Page 6: can be getting => can be obtained - Whole the manuscript: Tchebycheff => Tchebyshev - Page 6: The SLDM do the same action like the FLDM till he obtains his solution =>	- Title: A rough => a Rough - Done - Abstract, lines 4, 5, 7: (QP) => QP - Done - Introduction section, line 1: which described => which is described - Done - Line 14: uncertainty here uncertainties => uncertainty. Here uncertainties - Done - Line 3 from bottom: multi-objective under => multi-objective problem under - Done - Page 2: which its bounds => which bounds - Done - The statement "This paper is organized as follows:" should be written after the vertical space. - Done - The whole manuscript: 2st => 2nd, 3st => 3rd - Done - Page 4: UI problems given => UI of problems given - Done - The statement after the formula (30) should be rewritten in the understandable form - Done rewritten for " Find individual optimal solution of problem FLDM by obtaining the best and the worst solutions of his problem after transformation (29) problem into the classical problem by theorem (1,2)." - Page 6: can be getting => can be obtained - Done - Whole the manuscript: Tchebycheff => Tchebyshev - Done not, Tchebycheff name scientist



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The SLDM does the same action like the FLDM till he/she obtains his/her solution. Similar changes should be done in the whole manuscript - Page 7: as a control factors => as control factors - And the SLDM knows that using the optimal decisions $\{() () () ()\}$ as a control factors for the TLDM is not practical. – it should be reformulated in a clear form - His/her optimal solution => the optimal solution - do the same action like the => does the same action like the - The sentence “The FLDM goals may reasonably consider $(\neg) ()$ is absolutely acceptable and is absolutely unacceptable, and that the preference with $[]$ is linearly increasing” should be rewritten in a more clear form - This due to => This is due to - make any => makes any - page 8: Algorithm, Steps 4, 5, 9, 10, 15 should be rewritten in the more understandable forms - Page 9: which equivalent => which are equivalent - build the membership => builds the membership - page 10: his/her – the authors should clearly identify whom - then solves => then one solves - summary section => (QP) => QP (see the remarks to Abstract) - Page 10: Interval optimization => interval optimization - Reference 6: The address: Koszykowa 86,	- Page 6: The SLDM do the same action like the FLDM till he obtains his solution => The SLDM does the same action like the FLDM till he/she obtains his/her solution. Similar changes should be done in the whole manuscript - Done - Page 7: as a control factors => as control factors - Done - And the SLDM knows that using the optimal decisions $\{() () () ()\}$ as a control factors for the TLDM is not practical. – it should be reformulated in a clear form - Done rewritten for” The FLDM knows that using the optimal decisions $x_1^f, ((x_1^f, x_1^f), (x_1^f, x_1^f), (x_1^f, x_1^f))$, as control factors for the SLDM, are not practical. And also the SLDM knows that using the optimal decisions $x_2^f, ((x_2^f, x_2^f), (x_2^f, x_2^f), (x_2^f, x_2^f))$ as control factors for the TLDM is not practical. It is more reasonable to have some tolerance that gives the SLDM and TLDM an extent feasible region to search for the optimal solution, and also reduce searching time or interactions.” - His/her optimal solution => the optimal solution - Done - do the same action like the => does the same action like the - Done - The sentence “The FLDM goals may reasonably consider $(\neg) ()$ is absolutely acceptable and is absolutely unacceptable, and that the preference with $[]$ is linearly increasing” should be rewritten in a more clear form - Done rewritten for” The FLDM goals may reasonably consider $F_1(x_1^f, x_2^f, x_3^f, x_4^f) \geq F_1((x_1^f, x_1^f), (x_2^f, x_2^f), (x_3^f, x_3^f), (x_4^f, x_4^f))$ is absolutely acceptable and $F_1 \leq F_2(x_1^f, x_2^f, x_3^f, x_4^f)$; $((x_1^f, x_1^f), (x_2^f, x_2^f), (x_3^f, x_3^f), (x_4^f, x_4^f)), ((x_1^f, x_1^f), (x_2^f, x_2^f), (x_3^f, x_3^f), (x_4^f, x_4^f)), ((x_1^f, x_1^f), (x_2^f, x_2^f), (x_3^f, x_3^f), (x_4^f, x_4^f))$ is absolutely unacceptable, and that the preference with F_1, F_2 is linearly increasing. This is due to the fact that the SLDM obtained the optimum at $(x_1^f, x_2^f, x_3^f, x_4^f)$ which in turn provides the FLDM the objective function values F_1, makes any $F_1 \geq F_1 = F_1(x_1^f, x_2^f, x_3^f, x_4^f)$ unattractive in practice.” - This due to => This is due to - Done - make any => makes any - Done - page 8: Algorithm, Steps 4, 5, 9, 10, 15 should be rewritten in the more understandable forms - Done rewritten for - Step4 Convert the lower and upper random interval coefficient in FLDM problem in to equivalent crisp models can be solved by classical methods.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	02-008 should be removed - Refs. 11, 14 – full name of the journal should be given - Refs. 3, 10, 12 – the spacing and commas should be corrected	- Step5: Convert the lower and upper random interval coefficient SLDM, and TLDM problem in to equivalent crisp models, go to step 6. - Step15: If the FLDM not satisfied with solution then go to step 9 with modifying $\omega(\underline{\omega}^L, \underline{\omega}^U, \overline{\omega}^L, \overline{\omega}^U)$. - But 9 and10 Done not - Page 9: which equivalent => which are equivalent - Done - build the membership => builds the membership - Done - page 10: his/her – the authors should clearly identify whom - Done not - then solves => then one solves - Done - summary section => (QP) => QP (see the remarks to Abstract) - Done - Page 10: Interval optimization => interval optimization - Done - Reference 6: The addres: Koszykowa 86, 02-008 should be removed - Done - Refs. 11, 14 – full name of the journal should be given - Done journal name “General Mathematics Notes” - Refs. 3, 10, 12 – the spacing and commas should be corrected - Done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		