SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org





Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_41240
Title of the Manuscript:	THE COST FOR SINGLE CHANNLE WAITING LINE MODELS
Type of the Article	Method Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Simulation Study	
	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.	
	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 (λ) and service rate (μ) 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? 	
	<u>Conclusion</u> There are no significant values of results included in conclusion that lead to novelty.	
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract - 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.	
	Keywords -Keywords should be written in alphabetical order.	
	Introduction -The previous studies from paragraph four until eight should be combining into two paragraphs.	
	<u>Waiting Line Costs</u> -Please revise this sentence "On the other hand, a firm can retain a large staff and provide many service facilities. This can become expensive".	
	Simulation Study	

	Simulation Study -Symbol should be <i>italic</i>	
Optional/General comments	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. The author should revise this paper according to the format.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohd Faridz Mod Yunoh
Department, University & Country	Faculty of Engineering & Built Enviroment, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia