

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_82945
Title of the Manuscript:	An Application of Single and Multi-Server Exponential Queuing Model in Some Selected Hospitals of the North-Western Nigeria
Type of the Article	Case study

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:

(<https://www.journalajpas.com/index.php/AJPAS/editorial-policy>)

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>The abstract of the paper is repetitive, the objective is confusing. The keywords should be revised and it would be advisable to change them for others that are more appropriate. The study presented does not contribute anything new to the scientific community, no significant findings are reported. The methodology is incoherent. It cannot be replicated in other studies Very generic conclusions. References to authors in the text do not follow APA standards (guidelines). <i>Authors may take more data for this study were collected from different hospitals in North-Western Nigeria through observations and personal interview and also make a comparative study,during Covid-19 period lots of patients are affected</i></p> <p>The figures are blurred, nor do they add much significance to the finds. In other words, data can be presented descriptively rather than visually.</p> <p>As for the theoretical framework, there is a lack of references to support the study presented.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The contribution of the paper seems to be extremely limited, both in academic and practical terms. The proposed model only improves computation time, since the "traditional" method yields the same solution, and time difference is reduced to seconds. This could be highly important in other contexts, but not in this.</p> <p>The orientation is to solve an administration issue, which is clearly relevant. Yet, the conditions set seem to hinder its applicability. This is definitively the idea of this special section.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>I believe making changes is feasible for this case, considering the amount of effort and time that it would represent. Instead, I recommend the authors to look for a more suitable outlet to this research work.</p> <p>I encourage the authors to continue their task, but to choose better scenarios that cannot be contested in terms of relevance</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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chittaranjan Mallick
Department, University & Country	Parala Maharaja Engineering College, India