



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJPAS_41240</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>THE COST FOR SINGLE CHANNLE WAITING LINE MODELS</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Method Article</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Simulation Study</b></p> <p>The reviewer would like suggest the author to present the results in graph/plot to make the reader more clear about the results that presenting in this paper.</p> <p>The author not discussed the results in critical point:            -Why the cost for system and cost for queue was decreased when different between arrival rate (<math>\lambda</math>) and service rate (<math>\mu</math>) increased?            -Why the cost for the system and the cost for queue for the ( / / 1) is smallest when constant values chosen arbitrarily?            - Why the previous results the (M/G/1) model is the better model than the two models and the cost is change - when service rate distribution change or with different distributions?</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b>            There are no significant values of results included in conclusion that lead to novelty.</p>	<p>The researcher rewrite the results clearly and in critical point</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the reason for that refer to the utilization factor. The utilization factor or the probability that the service facility is used decrease when different between arrival rate (<math>\lambda</math>) and service rate (<math>\mu</math>) increased.</li> <li>- The reason for that refer to the distribution for the data is differ. The study made goodness of fit test by easy fit program for the data. The study suggests that the server cost = 4 and waiting cost = 2 as a constant for all cases to study the behavior for each model.</li> <li>- Although the study chose three distributions related with exponential distribution. However, the difference in the distribution used for the same method led to a difference in the cost values resulting and emphasized the objective of the study is that the distribution of data in the waiting line models will affect the cost</li> <li>- The researcher rewrite the <b>conclusion</b></li> <li>- The researcher rewrite the Abstract</li> <li>- Keywords written in alphabetical order</li> <li>- the researcher write the previous studies in separate paragraphs for each.</li> <li>- Symbol write between brackets.</li> </ul>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract</b>            - Please revise this sentence "The study results that first the cost which calculated from system which depend on the cost of queue is less for (M/D/1) model than the other two models when the same data are used"            -The novelty of study should be highlight in one sentence at end of abstract.</p> <p><b>Keywords</b>            -Keywords should be written in alphabetical order.</p> <p><b>Introduction</b>            -The previous studies from paragraph four until eight should be combining into two paragraphs.</p> <p><b>Waiting Line Costs</b>            -Please revise this sentence "On the other hand, a firm can retain a large staff and provide many service facilities. This can become expensive".</p> <p><b>Simulation Study</b>            -Symbol should be <i>italic</i></p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Generally, this paper works well as long as the reader is primed in advance of the structure the author will be adopting. The reviewer would like to suggest this paper should be proof read to make it clearer.</p> <p>The author should revise this paper according to the format.</p>	