SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_BJMCS_14799**
Title of the Manuscript:	**TRANSIENT SOLUTION OF MACHINE INTERFERENCE PROBLEM WITH AN UNRELIABLE SERVER UNDER MULTIPLE VACATIONS POLICY**
Type of the Article	**Short 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	**In this manuscript, the authors considered a machine interference problem with an unreliable sever under multiple vacations polity. They first obtained the numerical solution of the system with ODE45 in MATLAB programming language. Then they discussed some expected values of the system reliability indexes with different parameters. This manuscript is of interesting but there are many grammatical mistakes throughout the paper. And there are some problem I proposed as follows:** **1. The transient solutions of the system the authors obtained are numerical solutions but not analytical solutions. Therefore, in my opinion, the well-posedness and stability of the system solution should be considered at first.** **2. Parameter " θ (\theta)" appeared in equations 1-9 is not explained in the manuscript.** **3.In page 4, lines 121-122, "9. Variance:..." may be explained incorrectly.** **4.The titles of Tables 1-4 should not be the same.** **5.The order of Table 3 and 4 should be exchanged.** **6. "SD" in Table 5 is not explained.** **7.In my opinion, the authors do not explain Tables 1-11 completely. Actually, the authors can display figures corresponding to Tables 1-11, which should be more clear for readers.**	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**China**