



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJPAS_47921</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>COMPARATIVE STUDY OF FAILURE RATE OF BANK'S ATM : LOG NORMAL DISTRIBUTION APPRAOCH</b>
Type of the Article	<b><u>Original Research Article</u></b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>This research determined time to failure rate and number of successful transaction of selected banks in Nigeria, using Lognormal distribution. Transformation technique was applied to the log-normal model to obtain a quadratic equation or polynomial regression that assisted in determining the parameters of the log-normal model. Also, one-way ANOVA was used to test for equality of the mean (or average) time to failure rate and mean number of successful service time of the banks. The research fitted the log-normal models of the banks and the result showed that GT-Bank model has the highest variation of 90.3% for number of successful service time (t), while Fidelity bank model has the highest variation of 56.6% for time of failure rate with the help of SPSS 21 statistical software. The one-way ANOVA result of the number of successful service time (min) showed a significant difference. The Tukey comparison tests showed that GT bank is significant at (5% or 10%) from others while UBA bank is significant at 10% from others. Hence, the number of successful service time (min) were not the same for all the five banks. The number of successful service time (min) was the same for other banks except UBA. The one-way ANOVA result of the banks in number of Time to Failure (t) (min) showed no significant difference among the five banks.</p> <p>In my opinion, the paper is well written and organized. The work of the paper is correct. However, there are some comments to improve the quality of the paper which are given as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the introduction part, the author should give more background works in details about advantages of the proposed method over the existing methods</li> <li>Some remarks on the computation complexity of the obtained results should be given.</li> </ul>	All corrections are considered and modified
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	