

REVIEWER COMMENTS

PAPER ID: 430

No	Comment (for Reviewer)	Reply to Comment / Change Description (for Author)	Page No.
1)	This paper discusses the optimization of over current relays using the Grey Wolf Optimizer (GWO) method. The writing structure of the paper is well presented so that it is easy to follow by the reader. To further clarify the contributions that have been mentioned and improve the readability of this paper, the following points and suggestions need to be considered carefully:		
2)	In the abstract, it is mentioned that many methods such as GA, PSO, FA, and GOA have been used in TDS optimization of OCR. However, for result validation, the proposed GWO algorithm is only compared with GOA. Is there any special reason why it is not also compared with the results from GA, PSO, and FA so that it is more complete and detailed how the advantages of the proposed GWO?		
3)	In the introduction:		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The literature study is still only about the basic theory that will be used, but it does not reflect what distinguishes this publication paper from previous ones. An explanation should be added that represents the difference. - The introduction also does not clearly state the contribution of this publication paper. 		
4)	In the paper, it is mentioned that the optimization objective is to minimize the duration of relay operation to protect the unaffected area. However, the mathematical statement in equation 9 does not reflect this objective.		
5)	<p>In the flowchart section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The flowchart of the GWO algorithm for the protection system does not reflect how the GWO algorithm works to achieve the objectives set in the optimization. - The flowchart should explain the algorithm, it is general, so it should not state the name of the software used such as matlab or the like. 		
6)	In general optimization, there are constraints that must be met. In this paper, there is an explanation of the constraints used in optimization presented in the problem section. However, in the results and analysis, there is no discussion that explains the compliance with the constraints set. Are the optimization results obtained really obedient to the existing constraints? This needs to be explained.		

7)	The conclusion should clearly state the superiority of the proposed algorithm. What is the superiority in terms of?		
8)	Consistency in writing equations must be maintained, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- There are some multiplication writings that use "x" and some without "x".- The writing of multiplication between constants and variables or between variables, some use spaces and some without spaces, some use "." but some without ":".- Some equations are italicized and some are not.- The writing in subscript form needs to be considered and must be consistent.		
9)	The quality of the images, especially images in figure 6 to 11, are of such low resolution that they are difficult to read. We suggest improving the quality of the images so that they are clearer and easier to read.		