

Review of: "Improved Cosine Similarity Measures for q-Rung Orthopair Fuzzy Sets"

Utpal Mandal

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper introduces some novel cosine similarity measures for the q-rung orthopair fuzzy sets. The paper examines an issue of considerable interest and significance. I feel, however, that it suffers from a lack of clarity in its overall structure and the contents of some of the individual sections.

1. The abstract should be rewritten clearly, its structure is disorganized, I recommend the authors reorganize it according to the theme of background, goal, method, result, and contributions. What are the outcomes of this research?
2. The introduction and literature survey section is inadequate. Please add some recent articles to improve the literature. Many noteworthy research articles in this direction are not considered in this present version. The authors are advised to survey the literature more to upgrade the present form. The following articles may be included in the revised version: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41066-021-00290-2>; <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119879831.ch11>.
3. The introductory section must appropriately highlight the motivations and objectives of this research.
4. The "Conclusions" section intends to help the reader understand why your research should matter to them after they have finished reading the paper. It is suggested to organize this section much better. It should contain unique results, findings, limitations of this study and future research directions.
5. The description of specific future research directions should be extended in the last Section. Your proposed cosine similarity measures can be applied to plastic waste management, bio-medical waste management, and electric vehicle charging station selection. Please refer to the following articles and cite them properly in the future scope of this manuscript, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2023.110516>; <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2022.105299>; <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2023.120082>.
6. There are some punctuation and typographical errors throughout the paper that should be fixed.

Overall, I recommend a minor revision. In my opinion, the manuscript can be reconsidered if the authors can successfully address the issues raised by the reviewer.