



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 (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	<p>The authors must address the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction section is too weak. The author should rewrite and analyze the paper referring to other papers that have been published on recent years (2012-2014); need more recent references. • Fig. 1 is not clear. Dimensions cannot be read. • The authors compare the two lathe machines but the specifications of the machines are not in the paper. • Scenarios are not comparing with each other. <p>If there is any ethical issue then please clarify.</p>	<p>Introduction is now written in good form and contains all that is required.</p> <p>We can not copy new information that are not relevant to this study because of current dates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dimensions are now stated under methodology and in abstract. • Figure 1 is now made clear. • The specifications are now added. <p>Scenarios compared with each other; otherwise it will be difficult to select the best machine.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The authors do not announce systematically and clearly the results of the study.</p>	<p>Systematically and in clarity, I believed the result are ok.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>The results and analysis are poorly. The conclusion does not have any scientific interest.</p>	<p>May be the paper is not in the field of the reviewer.</p> <p>I think an Industrial engineer reviewer should look into this study.</p>