SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BJMCS_19209**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Machine Interference Problem with Reliable Server under Multiple Vacations Policy**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**The paper concerns the Machine Interference Problem. The domain is interesting but the paper requires improvements at the levels of the contents and the shape. I think that the paper must be revised to show well the contribution of the authors. My remarks:** **- Abstract: too long. To reduce by showing the relevant results of the authors.** **- Introduction: too long. To revise by showing problems met in the literature, the objectives of the authors.** **- Paragraph 2: the authors handle the works developed by Ke (2006). What is the contribution of the authors?** **- Paragraph 4: the authors present results of simulation without showing their contributions in the domain. To see again ?** **- Conclusion: it is necessary to show the contribution of the authors?** **- Reference: add recent references.**	The abstract and introduction have been reduced and restructure to show the results obtained.
Minor REVISION comments	/	
Optional/General comments	/	