



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_42657
Title of the Manuscript:	MODELLING THE MEAN WAITING TIMES FOR QUEUES IN SELECTED BANKS IN ELDORET TOWN-KENYA
Type of the Article	Data 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	Explanation of equations 5, 6, 7, 8 is not elaborated. Since the authors are proposing the model for waiting delay in the queue, derivation of the model is missing in the paper. Objective of the paper is to develop deterministic and stochastic waiting models for the bank environment, but no such things are discussed. M/M/c queuing is considered for the paper work. M/M/c queuing model considers c servers. In the text given, consideration of 2 servers and three servers. But the mathematical representation is not showing the consideration of multiple servers. The author has given in the conclusion that real bank queue data has been collected from various selected banks for the development of queuing model. But no such things are shown in the paper.	Equation part has been revised Objective of the paper has been re-visited and corrected Thank you for your constructive suggestions and comments. We tried to incorporate the comment raised by the reviewer
Minor REVISION comments	The authors are proposing the development of estimated waiting time model that can be applied for real time bank queue data. The literature survey is weak and does not cover recent publications in this field. The paper has many grammar mistakes and poor sentence forming all over the paper. Eg., Page 3, "in the in a cycle". In Page 2, first paragraph, both service rate and arrival rate are denoted by same parameter λ .	Literature part has been improved by incorporating recent review Corrected as per the instruction
Optional/General comments	English writing quality is poor.	English writing has been improved throughout the manuscript