

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_77655
Title of the Manuscript:	QUEING THEORY, A TOOL FOR POLIO ERADICATION IN NIGERIA
Type of the 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Compulsory revisions are specified in the reviewed manuscript, Ms_AJPAS_77655.revised.docx, and in the Suggestions for Authors.docx file.</p> <p>The main issues that need revision are: - the general wording must be done in accordance with the Template of the journal, the current format being completely unsuitable for publication;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - mathematical equations and formulas must be written with a single mathematical editor (Microsoft Equation 3.0 is recommended) and each formula in a single box; - the writing of the symbols of the mathematical variables must be with the same Style, size and format both in equations and in the text; -English language and general expression need to be improved; -the symbols of the parameters whose values are listed must also be entered in the tables in the results chapter; - the references are few, in the text there is also a citation that does not seem to be included in the references, in the context in which the literature in the field is very rich; - The results have few commentaries. It is not specified whether the input parameters are taken from concrete cases or are only hypotheses suggested by the authors, given that, in the abstract, the authors claim to have validated the models for probable scenarios. See validation cases in the literature. In this case, at least one clinic or other health unit in Nigeria should be considered and shown what it would mean to improve the activity in this, if necessary. - The Introduction and Literature review chapters contain very few references. The literature on the theory of expectation is very numerous, as well as applications in the field of health, even in the field of combating polio and even in Nigeria (see the file Suggestions for the Authors.docx). Authors are invited to cite these references and comment on them in the Introduction and Literature review. Also, in the discussion chapter, results, it is recommended to compare the results of the authors with the results indicated in the cited literature. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>In order to appreciate the originality of the research in this article, the authors should specify which of the equations of the mathematical model they belong to, what changes they have made to the literature. The simple running of the software program specified in the paper does not give originality to the research. Running the program for certain data, collected from functional medical units (thus creating a GIS connection of the results), could give a minimum of originality to the article.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cardei Petru
Department, University & Country	Romania