



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 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The keywords do not exactly have the main objective of this study, the keywords should be universal and which express the contributions required.</p> <p>The introduction lacks a state of the art or literature review based on innovative research in recent years (2008-2014) in machine tools selection. Such as the use of artificial intelligence, the know-how of expert and the professional data bases.</p> <p>The state of the art of this paper is superficial; the author should improve this part by identifying the criteria used for the selection of machine tools, as well as techniques and modeling methods.</p> <p>The presentation of figures and equations without detailed discussion does not reflect the reality of this work; the author must explain the algorithms and figures to facilitate the reading of this paper.</p> <p>What is the limit of use of the model developed (What are the cases that can be success by the developed method in this paper and what are the cases that must not success).</p> <p>The English syntax does to present many deficiencies, however grammatically the paper is weak. A spell check before submission would considerably reduce most of them.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Line 39 , line 408, line 411,--- Yurdalu--- Yurdakul</p> <p>Scenario---Step</p> <p>VB program source code should be put in an appendix to this paper.</p> <p>Should be repeated the numbering of figures, there are figures untitled, also the form of references.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The selection of the machine tool depends not only on the cost of production, but also the details required workpiece (tolerances, roughness, material, ..., etc.). To present the contributions of this work, the author is asked to make another case study of a real workpiece, with a comparison of the results found with other selection models of machine tools.</p> <p>In the Reviewer opinion the paper is fair. The fundamental basis of the paper is not much interesting with potential interest to the community;</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Romdhane Ben Khalifa
Department, University & Country	Mechanical department, ISSAT Gabes, Tunisia