



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_19679
Title of the Manuscript:	Overall Service Effectiveness on Urban public Transport System in the City of Addis Ababa
Type of the Article	Original research papers

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	There are major grammatical errors in the manuscript starting from the abstract to the main body. The introduction should give a synopsis of transport information about Addis Ababa, fleet size and general operation performance of the company. In short, information about the company is grossly deficient. By gauging the company, what is the benchmark for optimum and acceptable OSE? There should be also definition of terms, literature reviews focused essentially on maintenance without really addressing the gap in the previous studies as it affects the application of OSE in urban transport operations. What are the indices that constitute quality ie customer satisfaction rate etc.?. Data presentation that form the bases of performance, quality and availability assessment is lacking.	The manuscript is revised based your comment so as to bring up its level. Synopsis of Anbessa City Bus Service Enterprise (ACBSE) is given in the last paragraphe of the introduction (in red color for all the comments) . Since it is a new concpet no international accepted standard, but I compare dit with the international standard of OEE. The data customer satisfaction rate is presented in Table1.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		