



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	/	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	/	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Khalil Kassmi</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Physics, Mohamed Premier University, Morocco</i>