



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_46379
Title of the Manuscript:	Switching-Algebraic Analysis of Multi-State System Reliability
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The results given in Table 5 are not showing any performance improvement with the 8 variable Karnaugh Graph as compared to 12 variable Karnaugh Graph. Abstract and Conclusion is not well written. Conclusion should not contain cited work. It should state only your contribution. Abstract looks weird and does not contain the contribution of this work in a brief way. Few grammatical mistakes are seen. Graphical results are not well explained.	Table 5 is used for a comparison of the present results with those in earlier work. The paper never mentioned any performance improvement with the 8-variable Karnaugh Graph as compared to 12-variable Karnaugh Graph. We just avoided the 12-variable Karnaugh map because it is too large. Citations within conclusions were removed. We made improvements to our abstract, conclusions and explanations.
Minor REVISION comments	Performance comparison with previous researches must be identified	Table 5 is used for a comparison of the present results with those in earlier work. It indicates exact agreement.
Optional/General 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	