



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013 BJMCS 4353
Title of the Manuscript:	COST COMPUTATIONS OF FUZZY M/M1 AND M/G/1 QUEUEING MODELS
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 128. Need to explain or footnote "convexity". Line 163. Illegible diagram is not professional. Lines 169-175. I felt a let-down here. Perhaps because it sounded like part of the Conclusion. Lines 180-182. It appears you are trying to tell of possible future investigation. However, the sentence is "run-on". Overall, nice paper. It would be good if you could devote a paragraph or two to trades/options you took. Was surprised not to see Klir referenced.	Convexity definition is given in preliminaries. Diagram is done again. Conclusion of the numerical example. Conclusion of the article. Rewritten. Thank you Sir/Madam. Preliminaries are given. Zimmerman is used as reference. klir is also added.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Line 143. It would be appropriate to elaborate on your options for ranking.	Centroid ranking is given in preliminaries some of the ranking methods available is also mentioned.