



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	-The first three paragraphs of the introduction are too general. The fourth paragraph, i.e., 'In some real-world...' is also too shallow. Write exactly, what problem do you consider and why it is important? - Literature review is poorly made, it is not related to any previously stated problem and the reader cannot understand what do you analyse? -the content of section 2 cannot be understood without prior clarification of all symbols. It requires an introduction to the rough set theory that is not present. -section 3 cannot be accepted in its current form, you have only one introductory statement that is completely confusing: How is it possible to convert 'The three-level quadratic programming problem' into the 'upper and lower approximations for crisp equivalent' Check the language or the meaning that you would like to express. - Section 4 is also poorly written, You wrote: 'At the beginning, we start by stating the first level decision maker problem' Why just in section 4 ? Do you resolve here any new problem that has not been previously considered? The following equations are left without any explanation. - Section 5, the algorithm is poorly presented; it is rather a shallow, linguistic description then any algorithm. Use any template for the description of algorithms, please - Because the notation has not been previously clarified, it cannot be understood what you are calculating in section 6. The reader may expect that you provide any evidence for the validity of your approach. I haven't found such evidence.	-The first three paragraphs of the introduction are too general. The fourth paragraph, i.e., 'In some real-world...' is also too shallow. Write exactly, what problem do you consider and why it is important? -In classical Programming linear (non-linear) programming problem aims to minimize (maximize) a linear (non-linear) objective function subject to a set of linear (non-linear) constraints. If the coefficients in the objective function and the constraints are exactly known crisp values, then these models can be solved by classical methods. But, in some real-world situations, the coefficients of decision making models are not exactly known. It is due to the fact that some of relevant data are inexistent, scarce, or difficult to obtain. Almost all concepts which we are using in natural language are vague. Perhaps some people think that they are subjective probability or fuzzy. Rough set theory was proposed by Pawlak in 1982 as a method for the joint management of vagueness and uncertainty. The basic idea in rough set theory is that any vague concept is replaced by a pair of precise



SDI Review Form 1.6

		concepts that are called the lower and the upper approximation of the vague concept. For a vague concept, the lower approximation of the concept is the union of all elementary concepts which are included in it, whereas the upper approximation is the union of all elementary concepts which have nonempty intersection with the concept .The rough intervals ,is introduced to adapt the rough set principles to model continuous variables. - Literature review is poorly made, it is not related to any previously stated problem and the reader cannot understand what do you analyse ? -Done not -the content of section 2 cannot be understood without prior clarification of all symbols. It requires an introduction to the rough set theory that is not present. - In my opinion, you cannot add information and theories rough space this will affect the appearance of paper in it solved a new problem -section 3 cannot be accepted in its current form, you have only one introductory statement that is completely confusing: How is it possible to convert 'The three-level quadratic programming problem' into the 'upper and lower approximations for crisp equivalent' Check the language or the meaning that you would like to express. - To convert the three-level quadratic programming problem with random rough interval coefficient in the objective functions into upper and lower approximations for
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		random rough interval coefficient to crisp equivalent, this process is usually a hard work for many cases in the following manner. - Section 4 is also poorly written, You wrote: 'At the beginning, we start by stating the first level decision maker problem' Why just in section 4 ? Do you resolve here any new problem that has not been previously considered? The following equations are left without any explanation. yes, I do resolve new problem that has not been previously considered - Section 5, the algorithm is poorly presented; it is rather a shallow, linguistic description then any algorithm. Use any template for the description of algorithms, please -Done not - Because the notation has not been previously clarified, it cannot be understood what you are calculating in section 6. The reader may expect that you provide any evidence for the validity of your approach. I haven't found such evidence. -Done not
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It is possible that the contribution of the paper is important. However, the problem is with the presentation that is very poor. In my opinion, the paper is very poorly written, poorly organized and demonstrates low technical quality, so that the reader cannot understand the contribution of the paper. You should first clearly specify the problem and explain why it is important. Then, without precise and complete specification of the notation it is not possible to understand the proposed solution.	