



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	1. It would be better if a short introduction to Addis Ababa urban public transport system can be added to the manuscript. 2. Without any discussion on policy implication, the article will be in the status of no contribution, I thus suggest to discuss some policy implication based on the results of analysis. 3. Although in Table 1, the authors display how to calculate Availability, Performance, and Quality, however, it remains unclear on how to obtain such relevant data as planned transport service time (930), transport service time (780) and so on. I thus suggest the authors to describe in more detail. 4. Please revise the manuscript by adding Keywords. 5. The format of each literature listed in references should be consistent.	1. Interlocution about the enterprise is given at the end of the introduction. 2. Corrected at the conclusions part 3. Explanation is given Table1 and Appendix 4. Key words are added 5. Amended based on the comment
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	6. In line 23, it should be Bamber et al. (2003), rather than Bamberet al, (2003). 7. In line 147, it should be A Monte Carlo, rather than Amote Carlo. 8. In references, no. 8 and no. 9 are duplicate. 9. Some articles cited in the text are missing in References, for example, Mehdi and Mohammadreza, cited in line 66. 10. Those articles have not been cited should not been appeared in References, for example, No.22.	6. Amended 7. Reference 9 is deleted 8, 9, 10. Missed articles are included and amended as recommended



SDI Review Form 1.6

	11. In line 68, instead of Borgonovo....., Borgonovo et al., (1999) would be better. 12. Similarly, in line 70, instead of Thomas and Jorn (2006), Thomas et al. (2006) would be better, since there are three authors.	11. accepted 12. accepted
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		