



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_9944
Title of the Manuscript:	A novel method for hesitant fuzzy multiple attribute group decision making with incomplete weight information
Type of the Article	Original 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	P37: By using the MATLAB mathematics software, the time (12 hours) that is used to obtain the optimal alternative with the Xia and Xu' method is far more than the one (1 second) that is used to obtain the optimal alternative with our method. The review wants to know: are the compared experiments implemented under the same conditions? What's the possible reasons for the great difference?	The compared experiments are implemented under the same conditions. The reasons for the great difference are as follows: The Xia and Xu' method performs an aggregation on the input hesitant fuzzy arguments. Accordingly, the dimension of the derived HFE may increase as such an aggregation is done, which may increase the computational complexity and therefore lead to the loss of information. In contrast, our method does not need to perform such an aggregation but directly deals with the input hesitant fuzzy arguments, thereby does not increase the dimension of the derived HFE and retains the original decision information as much as possible.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Check and improve the grammars, for instance, P34 has the spelling mistake, words "TOPIS" should be "TOPSIS"; 2. The figure 1 is too far to the cited place.	1. We have checked and improved the grammars, for example, the word "TOPIS" has been replaced by "TOPSIS" on Page 19 of the revised version. 2. The figure 1 has been placed in the cited place.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. About Definition 2.2~2.4, could they be extended to n hesitant fuzzy elements, such as three, four?	Definitions 2.2-2.4 can be extended to n hesitant fuzzy elements.