

1. English language editing is required for minor grammatical and linguistic issues throughout the text.

Example (p. 2):

“... area of disaster management, which helps to choose the most appropriate plan...”

*Suggested correction:* “which helps in choosing the most appropriate plan...”

2. Equations and definitions are mostly clear but occasionally dense; consider adding simpler intuitive explanations for clarity.

Example (p. 5, Definition 2.10):

$$\eta_1 \preceq_{\mathfrak{X}_1} \eta_2 \Rightarrow \Omega_{\Theta}(\eta_1)(g_a) \leq \Omega_{\Theta}(\eta_2)(g_a), \mathcal{N}_{\Theta}(\eta_2)(g_a) \leq \mathcal{N}_{\Theta}(\eta_1)(g_a), \Delta_{\Theta}(\eta_1)(g_a) \leq \Delta_{\Theta}(\eta_2)(g_a), \nabla_{\Theta}(\eta_2)(g_a) \leq \nabla_{\Theta}(\eta_1)(g_a) \quad \forall g_a \in G$$

*Comment:* This formal definition is correct but would benefit from an intuitive explanation or example to help readers unfamiliar with fuzzy set theory understand the ordering conditions.

3. The numerical example provided is illustrative and demonstrates how the approach functions, but its scale and complexity are limited.

Example (p. 12, Table 1):

Only three alternatives ( $g_1, g_2, g_3$ ) and four parameter combinations ( $\eta_1$  to  $\eta_4$ ) are considered, with limited variations in the numeric values.

*Comment:* Expanding to more alternatives or deeper parameter hierarchies could better demonstrate the scalability and flexibility of the approach.

4. To demonstrate reproducibility, the authors must clearly specify parameters, initial conditions, and the reasoning behind numerical choices (e.g., why  $q = 3$  was chosen and how data was gathered or simulated).

Example (p. 12):

“We will assume that  $q = 3$ ”

*Comment:* No justification is provided for this choice. The authors should specify why  $q = 3$  is appropriate or typical for this type of decision problem.

5. Authors must clearly specify if the data provided in the numerical example is hypothetical or empirically derived. If empirical, indicate explicitly how the data was collected to ensure reproducibility.

Example (p. 12):

“( $\Theta, \mathfrak{X}_1$ ) =  $\{\eta_1, \{g_1 \langle (0.33, 0.87), (0.31, 0.82) \rangle, \dots\}$ ”

*Comment:* These values are presented without stating whether they are simulated, expert-derived, or empirically measured. This needs clarification.

6. “National Response Framework (<https://www.fema.gov/emergency-managers/national-preparedness/frameworks/response>) that out-lines...” should appear as a BibTeX reference.

Example (p. 11):

“The US government released an article called the National Response Framework (<https://www.fema.gov/emergency-managers/national-preparedness/frameworks/response>) that out-lines...”

*Suggested replacement:*

```
@misc{fema2023nrf,
title      = {National Response Framework},
author     = {{Federal Emergency Management Agency}},
year       = {2023},
howpublished = {\url{https://www.fema.gov/emergency-managers/national-preparedness/frameworks/response}}
note       = {Accessed: 2025-XX-XX}
}
```

7. A brief but explicit comparative summary or a structured comparative table outlining key differences from existing methods (including performance, theoretical properties, and computational advantages) should be included.

Example (p. 13):

“To demonstrate the potency and efficacy of the suggested concepts and the MADM approach, a comparative assessment that describes the theoretical improvement of the proposed study and its contribution to the field of disaster management is presented.”

*Comment:* The comparative discussion remains mostly narrative. A structured comparison table would provide clearer insight into the advantages and limitations of the proposed method compared to established techniques.