



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2015_AIR_18480
Title of the Manuscript:	A MODEL FOR CALCULATING THE MACHINING TIME OF A LASER CUTTING MACHINE
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The authors performed an effort to present the details of their proposed model but the discussion of the results and the general presentation of the paper is far away from being satisfactory.. Some main comments are summarized below:</p> <p>? The discussion of the obtained results should be more sufficient as deeper explanations on this issue are required. This part is the most important part of a manuscript but a significantly short section is dedicated to commenting on the obtained results.</p> <p>? The English of the paper is poor with many grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. A native English speaker can be helpful.</p> <p>? The contribution of the paper should be better highlighted within the introduction part. The topic is widely discussed in the literature and even the proposed methodologies includes some different features, the novelty is not sufficiently clear.</p> <p>? The technical field applicability is not widely evaluated also with relevant computational statistics analysis.</p> <p>In its current state, the level of English throughout your manuscript does not meet the journal's desired standard.</p>	<p>Further explanation has been offered on the results.</p> <p>This is noted and has been attended to.</p> <p>The introduction, methodology and discussion of the results have been re-drafted.</p> <p>English has been edited.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		