Comments on Review

- Incomplete abstract
  - mention what current literature does to solve the problem
  - why BAP was modified
  - main results of paper
- ~~More related works~~
  - ~~if the proposal is something new,~~ ~~it should highlight why researchers are not working on it~~
- Organization in the experiment
  - Put the figures on the same page
  - More commentary on the results
- Better explanation of results
  - Strong/weak points of the MILP approach

Reviewer 10 of ITSC 2022 submission 1145

Comments to the author
========================

Strengths: on General, the paper works on an interesting topic, and the formulas seem to be correct.
Weaknesses: there are problems in the abstract, a lack of related works, a lack of organization in the experiment section, and also a lack of better explanation of the results. I explain better each one of these points below:

It is worth re−reading the paper to correct some small typos and phrases.
Ex: Section II the BAP is introduces with a MILP formulation (Section II, the BAP is introduced)
There are other errors like that in the paper.

The abstract is quite incomplete, in my opinion. It should quickly mention what the current literature does to solve the problem, why the BAP was modified, and the main result achieved in the paper.

There is also a lack of related works; if this proposal is something new, it should be highlighted why researchers are not working on it.

Section 4 has two negative points: 1) it should be more organized, especially the figures, and 2) the results should be better explained, especially the reason for some discrepant values in figures 5 and 7.

Regarding item 1), I would suggest putting them on the same page, or at least on two consecutive pages, so that they could be presented before the references. It will make the paper more organized, and the explanations of the results will be less difficult to follow.
Regarding item 2), I would suggest that the authors explain the results beyond just saying what is already readable in the graphs. That is, explaining the reasons for some values, at least the discrepant ones.

I also missed seeing the strong and weak points of the method investigated, which could give the readers a synthesis of the method's core and what can be done to improve it as related/future work.