



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_15691
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPUTER AIDED SYSTEM FOR UNI-FUNCTIONAL JOB SHOP MACHINE SELECTION BASED ON PRODUCTION COST AND TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT.
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	Referencing styles are not coherent and grammar of the manuscript has many problems. Basic break-even point analysis has been coded with Visual Basic and preliminary user interface has been added for the input guidance. Referencing is not adequate.	The references has been written to be coherent. All grammatical errors has been corrected. These has been done, but those not need were not added.
<u>Minor REVISION comments</u>		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Totally unsatisfactory study as a research article.	Not compulsory that you should be satisfactory. Since other four reviewer still find the manuscript satisfactory it is ok.