

Review of: "The Application of PROMETHEE with the recalculated weight method as a more accurate measurement for the selection of the best Hybrid Renewable Energy Technology for a slum building"

Prasad Bari¹

¹ Fr. C. Rodrigues Institute of Technology

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

Title: - The Application of PROMETHEE with the recalculated weight method as a more accurate measurement for the selection of the best Hybrid Renewable Energy Technology for a slum building

Comments: -

1. In the abstract, the statement, 'The objective weights and subjective weights are obtained initially from the AHP/Fuzzy AHP and Critic/Entropy methods', is not clear with the inclusion of the slash symbol.
2. In section 1, the fifth paragraph is to be rewritten with acronym details for all the methods with uniformity.
3. In section 1, mention the country where the city Cuenca is located.
4. In section 1.1, in the statement, 'Thus this paper aims to increase the understanding of the application of the recalculated weight method and validate its application with various MCDM methods', the various methods need to be mentioned specifically.
5. In section 1.1, what does 'GKUA' stands for? It needs to be stated there as it appears over there the first time.
6. In section 2, the description of figure 2 in the text, 'According to Figure 2, the highest wind speed was obtained in January (3.5m/s) while the lowest value was recorded in October (2.4m/s)', does not match with figure 2.
7. In section 2.2, the power rating of electrical appliances is denoted by d_{load} in equation 1 and by D_{load} in the text.
8. In table 1, units are mentioned in the title row and therefore not required in the table.
9. In section 2.3, in the description of design specification, the second point seems to be incomplete while in the fourth point how is the lifetime 00 hours?
10. The description of figure 4 is missing in the text.
11. In section 3, in point number 5, what does HRES stands for?
12. In section 3, equations need to be rewritten appropriately. The description of a few notations is not mentioned.
13. In section 3, equation number 28 is mentioned twice for two different equations.
14. In section 3.7, the statement, 'This is obtained using the recalculated and the combined weight method and validated with TOPSIS and VIKOR', needs to be mentioned with its details.
15. It is observed that 10 criteria are considered but the details of the same seem to be missing.

16. In section 4.3, the table shown, is table 1 or table 5?
17. In the last section of the discussion, the authors can discuss the limitation of the work done and the future scope if any.
18. The reference section is appearing twice.