



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_22097
Title of the Manuscript:	The classification of criticality for spare parts by applying the ratio of production lost cost to spare parts inventory cost
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The paper is not understandable for its very poor English writing. The authors failed to provide strong literature review to support their work. Even conference papers are required to provide more supports for their arguments. Paper, does not provide <u>Conclusion</u>, though it had been listed on the <u>Abstract</u> section. Such a poor organization and structure is not acceptable.	It is already improved the English writing. In the paper is already provided many arguments in literature review from reputation international journals. I do not understand, why does it need to provide more conference papers? Because papers in journal are usually better than papers in conferences. It is already provided the conclusion. "Such a poor organization and structure is not acceptable", I do not know the meaning, if reviewer mean that paper without conclusion, it is already provided.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		