

View Reviews

Paper ID

260

Paper Title

A Hybrid Fuzzy AHP-VIKOR Framework for Systematic Evaluation and Ranking of Metaverse Applications

Reviewer #1

Questions

1. Whether the paper belongs to the theme of the conference?

Yes

2. Does the paper follow the Springer template as specified: <https://mckvieconferences.in/downloads/>

Yes

3. Are the references formatted correctly according to the provided template?

Example: [1] Khan, B. H., A framework for web-based learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications (2000). [2] Loganayagi. B, S. Sujatha, Enhanced Cloud Security by Combining Virtualization and Policy Monitoring Techniques, Procedia Engineering 30, 654-661, (2012).

No

4. Is the literature cited correctly, for example, as Chatterjee et al. [1]?

No

5. Are there at least 20 references cited in the paper?

Yes

6. Is the literature review up-to-date till 2024?

Yes

7. Is the abstract free of abbreviations?

Yes

8. Is passive voice used throughout (avoided use of "I," "we," etc.)?

Yes

9. Is the literature review in the past tense?

Yes

10. Are figures numbered as whole numbers (not sections) and bottom left aligned?

Yes

11. Are tables top-labeled as required?

Yes

12. Are all figures and tables cited in the paper?

Yes

13. Are the figures/tables cited sequentially in the paper?

Yes

14. Are there any figures/tables present in the paper that refer to other sources in the figures/tables caption? If "Yes", then the authors need to submit the granted permission/clearance copy.

No

15. Are all the tables/equations in the paper editable?

Editable

16. Does the paper demonstrate originality?

Moderate improvement or variation of existing work

17. Additional Comments from Reviewer: (Please provide specific comments or suggestions to address the above-mentioned issues, if any with additional comments)

1. Flowchart of the methodology is needed for proper understanding.
2. What is the reason behind using Fuzzy AHP and VIKOR algorithm instead of using other algorithms?
3. The data collection part is not clear? How you collect the data from expert? Is it crisp value? or Is fuzzy concept used? Add proper explanation preferably with some visual inferences.
4. Research gap should be stated after previous work section.
5. The result section needs some graphical representations
6. Some typos and grammatical errors are present throughout the paper.
7. When calculating weight criteria, add comparison matrix accordingly.
8. Add the value of utility measure (S_i) and regret measure (R_i) in the ranking table for proper understanding. Or you can add individual table for that.
9. Please maintain same referencing format for all.

Reviewer #2

Questions

1. Whether the paper belongs to the theme of the conference?

Yes

2. Does the paper follow the Springer template as specified: <https://mckvieconferences.in/downloads/>

Yes

3. Are the references formatted correctly according to the provided template?

Example: [1] Khan, B. H., A framework for web-based learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications (2000). [2] Loganayagi. B, S. Sujatha, Enhanced Cloud Security by Combining Virtualization and Policy Monitoring Techniques, Procedia Engineering 30, 654-661, (2012).

No

4. Is the literature cited correctly, for example, as Chatterjee et al. [1]?

Yes

5. Are there at least 20 references cited in the paper?

Yes

6. Is the literature review up-to-date till 2024?

Yes

7. Is the abstract free of abbreviations?

No

8. Is passive voice used throughout (avoided use of "I," "we," etc.)?

Yes

9. Is the literature review in the past tense?

No

10. Are figures numbered as whole numbers (not sections) and bottom left aligned?

Yes

11. Are tables top-labeled as required?

Yes

12. Are all figures and tables cited in the paper?

No

13. Are the figures/tables cited sequentially in the paper?

Yes

14. Are there any figures/tables present in the paper that refer to other sources in the figures/tables caption? If "Yes", then the authors need to submit the granted permission/clearance copy.

No

15. Are all the tables/equations in the paper editable?

Editable

16. Does the paper demonstrate originality?

Moderate improvement or variation of existing work

17. Additional Comments from Reviewer: (Please provide specific comments or suggestions to address the above-mentioned issues, if any with additional comments)

1.name given-table 2 more than one time

2. typo and grammatical errors are present

3. Why the VIKOR method is used among so many methods?
4. Why you use the fuzzy concept here? is your data not fixed?
5. Data collection part should elaborate properly? how the data is collected from expert? what is the type of the data?
6. what is the pairwise comparison in your work? give the matrix for easy understanding of readers.
7. why the data collection part is present in result and discussion..modify accordingly.
8. what is low, medium and high in table 1?
9. Add proper diagram of your research methodology.
10. Graphs/charts representation of results should be included.
11. Research gap should be stated after previous work section.
12. In the last table in your paper the heading "Rank" will be Q_i , not Rank..If "not" , give your reason. if "yes" add the "Rank" column properly with 1, 2, 3,.....
13. "Outputs and Deliverables " this section is not required individually as the result section is already discussed.